LYGDAMUS

CORPUS TIBULLIANUM III.1-6: LYGDAMI ELEGIARUM LIBER

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

J.M. BREMER · L.F. JANSSEN · H. PINKSTER

H.W. PLEKET · C.J. RUIJGH · P.H. SCHRIJVERS

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

C.J. RUIJGH, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM CENTESIMUM QUINQUAGESIMUM QUARTUM

FERNANDO NAVARRO ANTOLÍN (Ed. & Comm.)

LYGDAMUS

CORPUS TIBULLIANUM III.1-6
LYGDAMI ELEGIARUM LIBER

LYGDAMUS

CORPUS TIBULLIANUM III.1-6
LYGDAMI ELEGIARUM LIBER

EDITION AND COMMENTARY

BY

FERNANDO NAVARRO ANTOLÍN

TRANSLATED BY J.J. ZOLTOWSKI

E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KÖLN
1996

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Navarro Antolín, Fernando.
Lygdamus : Corpus Tibullianum III. 1-6: Lygdami elegiarum liber / by Fernando Navarro Antolín.
p. cm. — (Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum, ISSN 0169-8958 ; 154)
Originally presented as the author's thesis (doctoral—University of Seville).
Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.
ISBN 9004102108 (cloth : alk. paper)
1. Lygdamus—Criticism and interpretation. 2. Elegiac poetry, Latin—Translations into Spanish. 3. Elegiac poetry, Latin—History and criticism. 4. Lygdamus—Translations into Spanish. 5. Elegiac poetry, Latin—Authorship. 6. Lygdamus—Authorship. 7. Tibullus--Authorship. 8. Rome—In literature. I. Lygdamus. Spanish. 1995. II. Title. III. Series.
PA6497.L9A58 1995
871'.01—dc20 95-20759
CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

[Mnemosyne / Supplementum]
Mnemosyne : bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum. – Leiden ; New York ; Köln : Brill.
Früher Schriftenreihe
Reihe Supplementum zu: Mnemosyne
154. Navarro Antolín, Fernando: Lygdamus: Corpus Tibullianum III. 1-6: Lygdami elegiarum liber. – 1996
Navarro Antolín, Fernando:
Lygdamus : Corpus Tibullianum III. 1-6: Lygdami elegiarum liber / by Fernando Navarro Antolín. – Leiden ; New York ; Köln : Brill, 1996
(Mnemosyne : Supplementum ; 154)
ISBN 90-04-10210-8

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 10210 8

© Copyright 1996 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by E.J. Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

parentibus optimis

CONTENTS

Preface ... ix

Introduction ... 1
1. The *Qvaestio Lygdamea* ... 3
2. Lygdamus and Neaera ... 21
3. The Configuration of the *Corpus Tibvllianvm* ... 25
4. The Ms. Transmission of the *Corpus Tibvllianvm* ... 31

Critical Edition ... 41
Editiones et Commentationes in Apparatu Critico Lavdatae ... 43
Conspectus Siglorvm ... 49

Text ... 51

Translation Into Spanish ... 77

Commentary ... 91
Lygdamvs I ... 93
Lygdamvs II ... 147
Lygdamvs III ... 193
Lygdamvs IV ... 258
Lygdamvs V ... 413
Lygdamvs VI ... 459

Bibliography ... 529
Appendix ... 551
Index Avctorvm ... 559
Index Locorvm ... 570
Index Rervm ... 616

PREFACE

Since J. H. Voss made a clear distinction, in 1786, between the genuine works of Tibullus (books I–II) and those wrongly attributed to him (book III), his conclusion that the last book of the *Corpus Tibullianum* is not by Tibullus himself has been shared by the majority of classical scholars interested in the elegiac genre. Since Voss published his work, there has been no lack of articles and monographic studies on each of the components of book III, regarded as works with an independent literary existence from the first two books of the *Corpus*. The present study continues this line of research, concentrating on the short cycle of poems by Lygdamus, which was for some reason ignored in the extensive commentary by K. F. Smith (1913). My chosen method of research is philological in the fullest sense of the term: a critical edition with a commentary covering all aspects of the text. Only in this way can a work of literature be fully understood, as was well known to the pioneers in philological studies, the editors of the Renaissance, although in subsequent centuries the wise old formula of combining in one single work a critical edition and philological commentary (who better to understand a text scientifically than the commentator, and who better placed to understand the content than the editor?) has fallen into some disuse, especially in Spain.

My main criterion, both in the critical edition and in the commentary, has been that of comprehensiveness. My aim has been to put together the greatest amount of information possible. The brevity of the object of study (290 ll.) has enabled me to consult considerably more material than if it had been the whole of the *Corpus Tibullianum*, for instance, or the epigrams of Martial: more mss. examined and more editions and commentaries consulted, both early and modern.

As far as the critical edition is concerned, I am firmly convinced that, given the obvious risk of not being able to see the wood for the trees, a critical apparatus should never aim to reflect exhaustively and *ad nauseam* the whole history of the text (that is, not only mss., *edd. vett. et recc.*, conjectures, etc., but even phonetic variants). While I also hold that a critical editor should never overspeculate concerning

conjectures, at the risk of falsifying the tradition, it is equally true that brevity and caution are not always the most valuable weapons of a good critical editor, since excessive brevity in the interests of clarity may conceal valuable information which might have enabled the reader to judge the editor's text properly, choose rejected variants or else come up with his own conjectures; and excessive caution robs the edition of much of its attraction and deprives it of its raison d'être, since it makes it difficult to perceive any practical results improving the text. Any new critical edition, in my view, should aspire to at least one (preferably both) of the following objectives: a) To offer a substantial improvement on previous editions, presenting a readable text, that is, one that will be of use to the simple reader-translator with no interest in questions of textual criticism, without requiring him to consult the apparatus; consequently, every attempt should be made to avoid the obelisks employed by over-cautious editors, who scar their texts with meaningless words or lines and force the simple reader to act against his will as an experienced textual critic; and b) To furnish the text with a critical apparatus as comprehensive and exhaustive as possible which will provide the reader who *is* interested in textual criticism with a useful tool which will enable him to opt, where appropriate, for other readings or conjectures than those presented, or even to make his own conjectures. What is the point of a miserly critical apparatus, generally of the 'dogmatic' *editio Oxoniensis* type, where all too often the obvious absurdity of the only or few variants offered leaves the reader in no doubt that the best reading is that chosen by the editor? If the idea is to prevent the reader from thinking freely, the best thing would surely be to forget about the critical apparatus altogether and present just the final text. In order to provide as much information as possible, it also seemed advisable to indicate in the apparatus the *auctoritas* of the editors who follow this or that reading or conjecture; for the sake of clarity, I have avoided the convenient but chaotic sigla of the *recc.* or *Itali*.

As for the the philological commentary, the ideal of comprehensiveness involves commenting on points of interest of all kinds (*realia*, literary *topoi* and motifs, mythology, metre, style, language, echoes, *iuncturae*, prose usages, *hapax legomena*, questions of textual criticism, etc.), as well as offering the reader a poem-by-poem, line-by-line and word-by-word commentary on the Lygdamean cycle. I have also attempted to make each entry in the commentary function as a short

article enjoying the greatest autonomy possible, where references to other works or commentaries, and quotations from modern editors, are, for the most part, express acknowledgement of my debt towards them rather than an indispensable complement for the understanding of the *locus* in question. I am sure that the reader's patience will not be overstretched by my exhaustiveness, as this is not a novel destined to be read *usque ad cornua*, but a commentary to be consulted on a particular passage, and it is my conviction that the reader will appreciate having as much information as possible at hand, and hardly have to consult the quotations from works which all too often are not to be found in his library.

I have added a useful tool at the end of the work in the form of an *Appendix* presenting in easily-consulted tables the readings and conjectures I have followed in the most controversial passages, as well as those followed by the most prominent editors of the *Corpus Tibullianum* in the course of the present century.

The present work originated as a doctoral thesis presented in the Faculty of Arts of the University of Seville in December 1993. Many of the improvements incorporated here are due to the valuable and perceptive corrections and suggestions of the members of the examining tribunal, and I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to them once again. Errors and omissions, needless to say, are attributable to me alone.

I would like to take this opportunity to state publicly how grateful and indebted I am to the co-directors of the thesis, Dr. Antonio Ramírez de Verger Jaén and Dr. José Solís de los Santos, mentors and friends.

I should also like to express my gratitude to J. J. Zoltowski for the translation, and also for several helpful suggestions and corrections.

The publication of this book has been made possible by the financial assistance of the 'Grupo de Investigación *Antonio Tovar*' (PAI 5054 Junta de Andalucía); the 'Proyecto de Investigación *Ovidio: opera amatoria II*' (PB92–0486 DGICYT); the 'Proyecto de Investigación *Corpus amatorium*" (PB94–1084 DG4CYT); and the 'Grupo de Investigación *Jacobo del Barco*' (PAI 5276 Junta de Andalucía).

Fernando Navarro Antolín
Seville, 30th May 1995,
Feast of San Fernando, patron saint of the city.

INTRODUCTION

1. THE *QUAESTIO LYGDAMEA*

Any serious attempt to study the poems of Lygdamus must necessarily take as its starting point the so-called *Quaestio Lygdamea*: Who is Lygdamus, when were his elegies composed, and what is his relationship with Ovid? Is he an ante-Ovidian poet, is he the young Ovid, or is he post-Ovidian?

The question of the date of composition of the Lygdamean elegies is by no means a trivial one, in view of the fact that the range of possible birth-dates suggested for Lygdamus covers such a wide period—and one so rich in literary milestones—as the years from 83 BC to 69 AD; or, in terms of literary *acmé*, from the mid 1st c. BC to the end of the 1st c. AD, that is, the Golden and Silver Ages of Latin letters. In terms of the implications for the history of Latin literature, and that of the elegiac genre in particular, it is clear that there is no comparison between the importance of establishing a date for Lygdamus and doing the same for an author like Maximianus the Etruscan, the last of the elegiac poets of Antiquity, whose chronology is also disputed. Whether we situate the latter in the middle of the 6th c. AD—the most widely-accepted dating—or else two centuries earlier or two to three centuries later is of relatively little consequence, since he is, after all, an author who is isolated in time, and variations in his dating have no serious implications. Of prime importance for the history of Latin literature, however, is the question of whether we consider Lygdamus to be earlier or later than Ovid or, even more drastic, earlier than Tibullus, or even identify him with the young Tibullus himself, which would convert Lygdamus, as if by art of magic, into the "first elegist" and founder of the most typically Roman literary genre (for all the claims of satire and the poet Gallus, of whom so little is known). Nor can there be any doubt that it is essential to take up some position on this question before producing a commentary and assessing the degree of originality or tradition in the literary art of Lygdamus.

Natalem primo nostrum videre parentes
cum cecidit fato consul uterque pari (Lygd. 5.17–18)

This distich, in which Lygdamus alludes to the year of his birth, and which is almost identical to this other couplet, in which Ovid refers to his own:

> *Editus hic ego sum, nec non, ut tempora noris,*
> *cum cecidit fato consul uterque pari* (*Tr.* 4.10.5–6)

has for centuries been the exclusive object of attention of those scholars who have concerned themselves with the short Lygdamean cycle, more interested in the identity of Lygdamus, and his relationship with Ovid, than in his work itself.[1]

The earliest commentators of the *Corpus Tibullianum*, from SCALIGER to HEYNE, never questioned the Tibullan authorship of the Lygdamus cycle (or indeed of the rest of book III), an attribution sanctioned by the manuscript tradition. They hold that this is the work of the young Tibullus, which he somehow thought it opportune or prudent to hide under the pseudonym *Lygdamus*.[2] They manage to get round the chronological difficulty involved in the much-debated biographical distich—for if Tibullus was born in 43 BC,[3] then he would have been a boy of 13 when he took part in Messalla's expedition to Aquitania (31 BC)—by rejecting the pentameter as an interpolation from Ov. *Tr.* 4.10.6.[4]

---

[1] In studying the Lygdamean question, I have found the following works particularly useful: H. DE LA VILLE DE MIRMONT, *Le poète Lygdamus*, Louvain, Paris 1904; A. CARTAULT, *À propos du Corpus Tibullianum. Un siècle de Philologie latine classique*, Paris 1906; M. SCHANZ-C. HOSIUS, *Geschichte der römische Literatur* II, *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* VIII.2, München 1935, pp. 185–188 (§ 282); F. W. LEVY (= LENZ), "Lygdamus", *RE* 13.2 (1937) 2217–2226; and, among the more recent studies, L. ALFONSI, *Albio Tibullo e gli autori del Corpus Tibullianum*, Milano 1946; L. PEPE, *Tibullo minore*, Napoli: casa editrice Armanni 1948; *idem*, "Rassegna di studi tibulliani", *Giornale Italiano di Filologia* 1 (1948) 159–168; *ibid.*, 2 (1950) 172–180.

[2] eg M. A. MURETUS, *Tibullus* (Lugduni 1559) 97: "Tibullum (ipsum enim esse arbitror, qui se ficto nomine Lygdamum vocat) . . .". In addition, the identification of Tibullus with Lygdamus (Gr. Λύγδαμις) was favoured by the fact that λύγδινος means "white (like marble)" (< λύγδος, "marble"), just as *Albius*, the *praenomen* of Tibullus, is derived from *albus* ("white"); cf. F. PASSOW, *Vermischten Schriften*, Lipsiae 1843, p. 169; L. DISSEN, *Albii Tibulli carmina* (Gottingae 1835) I, p. XXXII. R. EHWALD, on the other hand, (*Ad historiam carminum Ovidianorum recensionemque symbolae*, Gotha 1889, p. 6) derives *Lygdamus* from λύγδην ("sobbing"), which would associate the pseudonym with the pessimistic and lachrymose tone of the poetry.

[3] *Cum cecidit fato consul uterque pari* in Ov. *Tr.* 4.10.6 is a clear reference to the year 43 BC, when both consuls, A. Hirtius and C. Vibius Pansa, were killed in the battle of Mutina (cf. Cic. *Fam.* 12.25.6; Vell. 1.61.4; App. *BC* 3.293; Plu. *Ant.* 17).

[4] First suspected by SCALIGER; the line was later openly declared spurious by DOUSA and also BROUKHUSIUS (Amstelodami 1708) 335: *versus pentamer: qui si verus ac germanus exstiterit, iam nihil foret amplius cur in finienda Tibulli aetate fluctuaremus. Huius*

Among the early commentators, only I. A. VULPIUS (1749)[5] went any further, suggesting, without questioning the Tibullan authorship of the cycle, that *Lygdamus* was a pseudonym of Tibullus, who had presumably composed the elegies for a friend. VULPIUS thus opened up a line of research followed by those who have attempted to explain the significant differences between bks. I–II and bk. III without rejecting Tibullus as author of the latter, making a clear distinction between the protagonist of the love affair (Lygdamus) and the author (Tibullus).[6]

J. H. Voss,[7] in 1786, was the first to make a clear distinction between the genuine Tibullan work (bks. I–II) and the work erroneously attributed to Tibullus (bk. III). Since then, his conclusion that bk. III is not the work of Tibullus has been the generally-shared opinion of modern classical scholars interested in the elegiac genre,[8] particularly in connection with the Lygdamean cycle. In this respect, Voss puts forward several different arguments:

A) Tibullus, like Propertius and Ovid, only uses pseudonyms for the beloved, never for himself.

---

deperditi loco versiculum Nasonianum nobis obstrusit sinistra liberalitas nescio quorum tenebrionum. Fuit enim tempus, quum nullas lacunas in poetis ferrent scriptores librarii. Quis enim suo sibi aere codicem mancum ac mutilum praestinaret? Vidit difficultatem conciliandi temporis Scaliger, nec potuit se ipse expedire. Others like GUYETUS, VULPIUS (p. 248), HEYNE-WUNDERLICH (p. 305) and BACH go even further and consider the whole distich spurious; SPOHN (Leipzig 1819) even applies the interpolation sign to the three distichs 15–20; more recently M. W. FUSS (1867) continued to defend this opinion for distichs 17–20.

[5] *Albius Tibullus, eques Romanus, et in eum Io. Antonii Vulpii philologi ac rhetoris in gymnasio pataviano novus commentarius diligentissimus*, Patavii a. 1749.

[6] Among them J. G. HUSCHKE (*Albii Tibulli Carmina*. . ., Leipzig 1819, pp. 419 ff.): Tibullus, after singing of his own love affairs, decided to celebrate in his verses those of others (Lygdamus, Sulpicia, Cerinthus); and A. SANTORO (*Tibulliana* I, Altamura 1935, pp. 35 ff.): *Lygdamus* is the pseudonym of the protagonist of the real or imaginary love story sung by Lygdamus; V. CIAFFI, *Lettura di Tibullo*, Torino 1944, p. 170: Tibullus writes love elegies commissioned by one Lygdamus.

[7] J. H. Voss first put forward his thesis in *Musenalmanach* (Hamburg 1786) 80 ff., developing and elaborating it later in the prologue and notes to a translation of Tibullus (*Albius Tibullus und Lygdamus übersezt und erklärt*, Tübingen 1810, pp. 12 ff.) and finally in his critical edition of Tibullus (*Albius Tibullus und Lygdamus nach den Handschriften berichtiget*, Heidelberg 1811).

[8] It should also be observed that the poets Horace (*Od.* 1.33; *Ep.* 1.4), Ovid (*Am.* 3.9; *Tr.* 2.447–464), Martial (4.6; 8.70; 8.73.7; 14.193), Statius (*Silv.* 1.2.252) and Sidonius Apollinaris (*Ep.* 10), and the grammarians Charisius (1.145.8 Keil; 1.90.13; 1.126.4; 1.87.3), Diomedes (1.484.17 K.; 1.314.35), Marius Victorinus (127.7 K.) and Caesius Bassus (246.14 K.), when alluding to or citing the poet Tibullus, always refer to books I and II of the *Corp. Tib.*, the genuinely Tibullan books of Delia and Nemesis.

B) There is no convincing reason to consider Lygd. 5.18 an interpolation from Ovid. This pentameter is incompatible with the young Tibullus of the Aquitanian expedition. It is Ovid who is the imitator.
C) Ovid does not name Neaera in his Tibullan epicedion (*Am.* 3.9.31 ff.).
D) Ovid himself says that he was younger than Tibullus (*Tr.* 4.10).
E) Notable stylistic differences make Lygdamus a somewhat unskilful imitator of Tibullus. Voss is responsible for introducing the negative view of Lygdamus as a poet lacking in originality and poetic vigour.
F) The author is a Greek freedman, born the same year as Ovid, by the name of *Lygdamus*.

The followers of Voss went out of their way to stress the stylistic, linguistic and metrical differences separating Lygdamus from Tibullus, expanding on the mediocrity of Lygdamus to which Voss had already pointed (eg LACHMANN,[9] DISSEN,[10] TÖRNEBLADH,[11] MÜLLER,[12] ENGBERS,[13] KLEEMANN,[14] STREIFINGER,[15] HÖRSCHELMANN,[16] PAROLI).[17]

The thesis that Lygdamus and Tibullus are not the same person having now been demonstrated, scholars then turn their attention to the difficult task identifying Lygdamus:[18] Who is hiding behind this pseudonym, if *Lygdamus* is really such? What is the date of composition of the cycle? Is Lygdamus earlier or later than Tibullus? Who is imitating whom? And what is the connection with Ovid?

Attempts to identify Lygdamus began in 1831 with FR. OEBEKE,[19] who ventured the challenging hypothesis that the pseudonym of

---

[9] C. LACHMANN, *Albii Tibulli libri quattuor*, Berlin 1829.

[10] L. DISSEN, *Albii Tibulli carmina ex recensione C. Lachmanni passim mutata*, Gottingae 1835.

[11] R. TÖRNEBLADH, *De elegiis Lygdami commentatio*, Kalmar 1861.

[12] L. MÜLLER, *Catulli Tibulli Propertii carmina*, Lipsiae: Teubner 1874.

[13] B. ENGBERS, *De metricis inter Tibulli Propertique libros differentiis*, Monasterii 1873.

[14] S. KLEEMANN, *De libri tertii carminibus quae Tibulli nomine circumferuntur*, Straßburg 1876.

[15] J. STREIFINGER, *De sintaxi Tibulliana*, Würzburg 1881.

[16] W. HÖRSCHELMANN, "Beobachtungen über die Elision bei Tibull und Lygdamus", *Philologus* 56 (1897) 355–371.

[17] P. PAROLI, *De Tibulli arte metrica cum Lygdamo comparata*, Brescia 1899 (reviewed by V. BRUGNOLA, *BFC* 6, pp. 198, and N. PIRRONE, *RSA* 4, pp. 548–551).

[18] In fact, the poets Propertius (2.34), Ovid (*Am.* 1.15; *Ars* 3.329–338; *Rem.* 759–766; *Tr.* 4.10), Domitius Marsus (*Epigr.* in the Tibullan mss.) and Sidonius Apollinaris (*Carm.* 9.259–260), the historian Velleius Paterculus (2.36.3), the rhetoricians Quintilian (*Inst.* 10.1.93) and Apuleius (*Apol.* 10.26), whether quoting the poets who lived before their time or their contemporaries, never mention the name *Lygdamus*.

[19] FR. OEBEKE, *De vero elegiarum auctore quae tertio Tibulli libro vulgo continentur*, in *Jahresbericht über das Königl. Gymn. zu Aachen für das Schuljahr von Michaelis*, Aachen 1831, pp. III ff. L. DISSEN refutes this hypothesis in his 1835 edition of Tibullus (I, pp. XXIX–XXX).

Lygdamus conceals Cassius Parmensis, basing this notion on rather weak evidence: a) Horace in *Ep.* 1.4.3 refers to the *Cassi Parmensis opuscula*, contrasting them with the far superior elegies of Tibullus; b) The character of Cassius fits in well with the austerity shown by Lygdamus in his relations of love and friendship. To surmount the difficulty of his year of birth, OEBEKE brings it forward to 83 BC, when both consuls, G. Marius the younger and Gn. Papirius Carbo, died in the war against Sulla.[20]

Since then, many unlikely hypotheses have been presented, featuring a wide and colourful variety of candidates, but with little success.

F. HAASE (1837),[21] in a review of the commentary on Tibullus by DISSEN (1835), put forward a bold hypothesis, which even today enjoys the favour of some critics: *Lygdamus* is the Hellenized translation of *Lucius*, the *praenomen* of the second son of Messalla Corvinus, Lucius Valerius Messallinus.

O. F. GRUPPE (1839),[22] after an examination of the parallel Lygdamus-Ovid passages, concludes that it is Ovid who is the imitator, though not of another poet, but of his own youthful works: Lygdamus is the young Ovid and Neaera his second wife,[23] supposedly snatched from

---

[20] OEBEKE follows the arbitrary substitution of *cessit* for *cecidit* proposed by CH. F. AYRMANN (*Albii Tibulli... Vita* [Vitebergae 1719] pp. 126 ff.) to justify fixing Tibullus' birth in the year 49 BC, when the consuls G. Claudius Marcellus and L. Cornelius Lentulus both fled from Rome and Italy, in view of the imminent arrival of Caesar. According to PEPE (*Tibullo minore* [1948] 38) and other authors, OEBEKE takes the pentameter of Lygdamus as referring to the consuls G. Marius the younger and Gn. Papirius Carbo, although DISSEN (I, p. XXIX) states that OEBEKE «intellegens annum 671. ab urb. cond. ubi L. Cornelius Scipio et C. Iunius Norbanus Coss. vique et dolis ab C. Cornelio Sulla in Italiam reverso devicti: illum perfide deseruisse exercitum largitione corruptum, hunc proelio profligatum. Hoc igitur esse fatum par». As I have been unable to consult the work of OEBEKE directly, I cannot be certain who is reporting accurately the dating of OEBEKE. However, it is observed by T. ROBERT S. BROUGHTON (*The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* II, Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 1984 [= 1952], pp. 60, 62, 65–66), that Gn. Papirius Carbo and L. Cornelius Cinna were the consuls in the year 84 BC (670 *ab Vrbe condita*); the consuls of 83 BC (671 *ab Vrbe condita*) were L. Cornelius Scipio Asiaticus (or Asiagenus) and G. Norbanus; however, Gn. Papirius Carbo and G. Marius the younger shared the office in 82 BC (672 *ab Vrbe condita*). Is there therefore some confusion of years and/or consuls?

[21] *Jahrbuch für wissenschaft. Krit. hrsggb. v. der Societät für wissenschaft. Krit. zu Berlin*, 1837, p. 33.

[22] *Die römische Elegie* I (Leipzig 1839) 133 ff.

[23] Ov. *Tr.* 4.10.71–72, *illa sucessit, quamvis sine crimine coniunx, / non tamen in nostro firma futura toro.*

the poet by her parents because of his fickle and licentious behaviour.[24]

R. S. RADFORD (1913),[25] basing his argument on a detailed metrical and stylistic analysis of the works of Lygdamus, Tibullus and Ovid, concludes that Lygdamus is Ovid, since there are many differences between Lygdamus and Tibullus, while there are many parallelisms between Lygdamus and Ovid.[26]

N. SALANITRO (1938)[27] puts forward fresh evidence in favour of GRUPPE's thesis (Lygdamus = the young Ovid):

- *Tr.* 4.10.68, *nomine sub nostro fabula nulla fuit*, confirms that Ovid, fired by some youthful passion, had adopted a pseudonym.
- *Tr.* 4.10.41, *temporis illius colui fovique poetas*, is consistent with the imitation of comtemporary poets that can be detected in Lygdamus.
- *Tr.* 4.10.19–20, *at mihi iam puero caelestia sacra placebant, / inque suum furtim Musa trahebat opus*, suggests secretive poetic activity, under a pseudonym, on the part of Ovid, before his open, public activity.

A. ROSTAGNI (1939)[28] also defends the theses of GRUPPE, though with a certain reluctance and circumspection.

G. BALIGAN (1948)[29] is one of the last critics of any authority to defend

[24] GRUPPE's theory is refuted by W. S. TEUFFEL in his verse translation of Tibullus (Stuttgart 1835) and in his *Studien und Charakteristik zur griechischen und römischen Literaturgeschichte* (Leipzig 1871) 344 ff.; by A. R. ZINGERLE, *Ovidius and sein Verhältniss zu den Vorgängern und gleichzeitigen römischen Dichtern* I, Innsbruck 1869; and by E. BAEHRENS, *Tibullische Blätter*, Jena 1876. S. KLEEMANN, on the other hand, (*De libri tertii carminibus quae Tibulli nomine circumferuntur*, [Straßburg] 1876) although offering no further arguments, voiced support for GRUPPE's ideas, which C. MARCHESI (*Storia della letteratura latina*, I [Milano 1932] 449 n. 3), regards, among all those hitherto suggested, as "la più degna di considerazione".

[25] "The Juvenile Works of Ovid and Spondaic Period of his Metrical Art", *TAPhA* 44 (1913) 1–26; *ibid.*, 51 (1920) 146–171; "Tibullus and Ovid", *AJPh* (1923) 1–27, 230–259, 293–318; "The Ovidian Authorship of the Lygdamus Elegies", *TAPhA* 57 (1926) 149–180 (cf. *CPh* 22 [1927] 356–371).

[26] A thesis rapidly rejected by A. SANTORO, *Tibulliana* I (Altamura 1935) 12 ff.: Ovid repeats himself frequently in his work, but with regard to Lygdamus, and with the exception of the *cum cecidit* . . . pentameter, it is not licit to talk of repetitions, but imitations, or rather, reworkings, the same procedure and technique as can be observed in Ovid in the way he deals with the two genuine books of Tibullus.

[27] *Questioni Tibulliane* (Catania 1933) 19 ff.; *Tibullo* (Napoli 1938) 54 ff.

[28] First in "La *Vita* suetoniana di Tibullo e la costituzione del *Corpus Tibullianum*", *RFIC* 13 (1935) 25–51 (= *Scritti minori* 2.2 [Torino 1956] 303–341); then in his *Letteratura di Roma repubblicana ed augustea*, Bologna 1939, p. 372; *Storia della Letteratura Latina* II: *L'impero: da Augusto a Nerone*, Torino 1964, pp. 189–191. ROSTAGNI concludes: «Tuttavia il problema non ha avuto e non avrà forse mai la soluzione, prestandosi ad ipotesi diverse» (*Storia* . . ., p. 191).

[29] "Il terzo libro del *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Studi pubblicati dall'Istituto di Filologia classica della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università degli Studi di Bologna* I, Bologna, U. P. E.

GRUPPE's theses: Lygdamus is the pseudonym of the young Ovid, who takes the name from the slave of Cynthia (Prop. 3.6); with this pseudonym—used *una tantum* and in the very epitaph (Lygd. 2.29–30)—Ovid wishes to express his servile amorous submission to Neaera, just as Propertius defined himself as *servus amoris* in the epigram which he imagined ought to be inscribed on his tomb (2.13.35–36). The Lygdamean cycle is thus nothing more than a number of *carmina iuvenalia*, in which Ovid expresses his grief over the scandalous conduct of his first wife (as opposed to GRUPPE, who opted for the poet's second wife). In his view, numerous points of correspondence in content, language, style and metre, shared only by Lygdamus and Ovid, bear out the identification of Lygdamus with Ovid. Book III of the *Corp. Tib.* was written between 22 and 19 BC.[30]

A young A. LA PENNA (1951)[31] defends as the "ipotesi che offre . . . più probabilità" the identification of Lygdamus with Ovid, basing his argument on five points:

1) The coincidence of the year of birth (43 BC) indicated by the same formula.
2) The elegies in the Lygdamean cycle arise from a *discidium*, a divorce; Ovid was divorced twice.
3) It can be deduced from elegy 5 that Lygdamus is very young; Ovid's divorce occurs shortly after *pueritia*.
4) Ovid wrote verse which he might have rejected. His talent showed itself at an early age, and he could have written elegies like those of the Lygdamean cycle—falling short of excellence—when very young.
5) When repeating a line by another poet, Ovid introduces a variation, if only a slight one; on the other hand, at times he repeats some of his own lines without any change at all.

B., 1948, pp. 1–36. His ideas are criticized by E. PARATORE in "A proposito di due nuovi lavori su Ligdamo", *Aevum* 22 (1948) 85–110; BALIGAN replies in "Ancora su Ligdamo", *Aevum* 24 (1950) 270–290; and there is a further contribution from PARATORE, *ibid.*, pp. 291–299.

[30] *art. cit.* (1948) 15.

[31] First in his reviews of the *Introduzione allo studio di Tibullo* by B. RIPOSATI (Como-Milano 1945) in *Annali della Scuola Normale Sup. di Pisa* 15 (1946) 131–136, and of the edition of Tibullus by L. ALFONSI (Milano 1946), *ibid.* 18 (1949) 112–118; later in "Properzio e i poeti latini dell' età aurea", *Maia* 4 (1951) 62–67. His theses are refuted by E. PARATORE, "Sul problema dell' identificazione di Ligdamo con Ovidio", *Emerita* 20 (1952) 42–77; LA PENNA replies in "Ancora su Ligdamo e Ovidio", *A & R* 3 (1953) 105–110; and again, PARATORE in "Briciole filologiche", *Studi in onore G. Funaioli*, Roma 1955, pp. 317–353 ("Ancora su Ligdamo e Ovidio", pp. 332–339).

G. DONCIEUX (1888)[32] opened up a new line of research in identifying Lygdamus with Ovid's elder brother, a thesis which met with rapid acceptance with the French school[33] and the odd Italian scholar.[34] DOINCEUX works from an ingenious hypothesis of DE GOLBÉRY (1826);[35] this editor of the *Corpus Tibullianum*, when comparing the distichs in which Lygdamus and Ovid indicate their year of birth, observed that Lygdamus' hexameter does not have an equivalent value to Ovid's *editus . . . sum*, but, taking *natalem* as birthday, means "my parents celebrated my birthday for the first time" or "my first birthday",[36] which would mean he was one year old when the two consuls died: Lygdamus was thus born in 44 BC, and Ovid in the year 43. DONCIEUX goes one step further and connects this biographical fact with the information Ovid gives us about his brother, born on the same day in the previous year (*Tr.* 4.10.9 ff.), and whose early death, at the age of only twenty, he laments (*Ib.* 31).[37]

---

[32] "Sur la personnalité de *Lygdamus*", *RPh* 12 (1888) 129–134.

[33] eg FR. PLESSIS, *Histoire de la Poésie latine*, Paris 1909, pp. 365 ff.; M. PONCHONT, *Tibulle et les auteurs du Corpus Tibullianum*, Paris 1926 (= 1931²), pp. 120–128, though previously in "un mémoire présenté pour le diplôme d'études supérieures classiques à la Faculté des Lettres de Paris, en 1906" (*op. cit.*, p. 123 n. 1).

[34] B. RIPOSATI, *Introduzione allo studio di Tibullo*, Como-Milano 1968² (1945¹), pp. 59–60.

[35] PH. A. DE GOLBÉRY, *Albii Tibulli quae supersunt omnia opera varietate lectionum, novis commentariis, excursibus imitationibus Gallicis, vita auctoris et indice absolutissimo*, Parisiis 1826, pp. 421 ff.

[36] DE GOLBÉRY suggests following the reading *natalem* ***nostri primum*** *videre parentes* of certain mss. (instead of the traditional *primo nostrum*); cf. app. crit. *ad loc.* From this author on, critics have been divided into those who see in the autobiographical pentameter of Lygdamus a clear reference to his date of birth (A. LA PENNA, "Ancora su Ligdamo e Ovidio", *A & R* 3 [1953] 105–106; A. TRAINA, "*Primus dies natalis*", *Maia* 18 [1966] 279–280; A. SETAIOLI, "I *Carmina Epigraphica* e tre poeti latini", *Prometheus* 2 [1976] 67–77) and those who opt for his first birthday, following DE GOLBÉRY (M. PONCHONT, *Tibulle et les auteurs . . .*, Paris 1968, pp. 123–124 n. 3; E. PARATORE, "A proposito di due nuovi lavori su Ligdamo, *Aevum* 22 [1948] 305–306; B. RIPOSATI, *Introduzione allo studio di Tibullo*, Como-Milano 1945, pp. 52–53 n. 15); for the latter, *primo* is a pleonasm if *natalem* continues to be understood as "day of birth"; the former successfully devoted themselves to the task of accumulating evidence to demonstrate clearly the Latinity of this 'pleonastic' usage, but one which had the very function of avoiding the semantic ambiguity from which the term *natalis* had suffered since taking on the pregnant sense of "birthday"; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 94.1; 100.3; [Quint.] *Decl.* 4.12 p. 79.1 ff.; 9.20 p. 185.28 ff. Lehn.; Gell. 15.7.3; Cens. 16.1; 17.15; *CIL* 6.35126; 11.7856 (= *CLE* 2068; 2155 Lommatzsch). The question would therefore appear to be closed for good. The problem, in any case, is a secondary one, and one which is only prompted by the identification of Lygdamus with Ovid's brother.

[37] On the basis of the pseudonym *Lygdamus*, DONCIEUX ("Sur la personnalité de *Lygdamus*", *RPh* 12 [1888] 133) arbitrarily deduces that the 'praenomen' of Ovid's brother is *Lucius*.

It was not long before the objections[38] were voiced, the main ones being the following:

a) Ovid himself, when talking of his brother, far from emphasizing his poetic talent, stresses his rhetorical bent and his merits in this field (*Tr.* 4.30.18, *fortia verbosi natus ad arma fori*).
b) Not even in passing does Ovid name his brother in the passages of the *Tristia* (2.421–466) and *Epistulae ex Ponto* (4.16) in which he mentions all his friends who have written poetry.

H. KNEPPERS (1904)[39] proposed as author of the Lygdamean cycle the eldest son of Messalla, Marcus Valerius Messalla Messalinus. This hypothesis was taken up later, without any mention of KNEPPERS, by E. BICKEL (1950):[40] Lygdamus is Messalla Messalinus, the successful general of the Illyrian war, whose wife (= Neaera), wed to another while he was away at the front, he now wishes to win back by means of his poems; the fact that the author of *Ciris* dedicated his epyllion to him (*iuvenum doctissime*, l. 36) and that Ovid chose to address to him some of his poetic epistles from exile is witness to his links with poetry. Though born in 43 BC, Messalinus describes himself as *iuvenis* in the 5th elegy, written no earlier than 11 AD, with the evident desire that his advanced age should not hamper the possible return of his wife. *Lygdamus*, in the epitaph that closes the 2nd elegy (ll. 29–30) is not a pseudonym, or a metrical equivalent for the name of the poet, but a name corresponding perfectly to the *servus amoris* in the epitaph of Prop. 2.13.35–36, which served as a model for Lygdamus (a hypothesis previously put forward by BALIGAN in 1948).

In the view of H. WAGENVOORT (1917)[41] Neaera is the poetess Sulpicia, and Lygdamus one Servius Sulpicius, a first cousin of hers

---

[38] H. DE LA VILLE DE MIRMONT, *Le poète Lygdamus. Étude critique, suivie d'une éd. et d'une trad. de Élegies*, Paris, Louvain, 1904, pp. 53 ff.; A. CARTAULT, *À propos du Corpus Tibullianum. Un siècle de philologie latine classique*, Paris 1906, pp. 404–405; *Tibulle et les auteurs du Corpus Tibullianum*, Paris 1909, pp. 74 ff.; K. F. SMITH, *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus*, New York 1913, p. 76: «this interpretation of *natalem primo* . . . does not seem to be supported by good parallels in actual Latin usage»; A. ROSTAGNI, *op. cit.* (n. 28), p. 452.

[39] *De Lygdami carminibus*, Jenae 1904, pp. 28 ff.

[40] "Die Lygdamus-Elegien. *Lygdamus* appellativisch *servus amoris*. Messalla Messalinus als Verfasser der Elegien", *RhM* 103 (1960) 97–109; cf. his *Historia de la Literatura romana*, Madrid: Gredos 1982 (= Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag 1960), pp. 589–590. BICKEL had already presented this hypothesis in *RhM* 93 (1950) 312 and 324.

[41] "De Lygdamo poëta deque eius sodalicio", *Mnemosyne* 45 (1917) 122. Curiously,

and destined to become her husband. In the view of this critic, on the death of Messalla and Messalinus the elegies dedicated to Neaera and Sulpicia's works to Cerinthus were ound in the family archives of the *gens Valeria*, subsequently being added to the elegies by Tibullus due to a certain external similarity.

Other individuals of the period, with metrically equivalent names, have been suggested:[42] Valgius Rufus, Caesius Bassus,[43] Grattius Faliscus, Claudius Etruscus, and even Lucius Julius Calidus, a poet of the late Republic, of whom we know only through Cornelius Nepos (*Vita Attici* 12.2–4).[44]

There are several authors who, even though they make a clear distinction between Lygdamus and Tibullus, consider it extremely difficult to establish his historical identity precisely: thus, L. Bolle (1872),[45] a prominent detractor of Lygdamus, is of the opinion that the poet is a clumsy imitator of Tibullus, narrating an imaginary passion, and one devoid of any element of reality, a mere pretext for a simple exercise in style; C. Boehlau (1876)[46] places great emphasis on the absence of reality in the poetry of Lygdamus, stating that it is a falsification interpolated into the work of Tibullus; for L. Dissen

---

J. L. Butrica in a very recent article (*LCM* 18.4 [April 1993] 51–53) again takes up the old and forgotten hypothesis of Wagenvoort, expanding it and presenting in greater detail the historical identity of Lygdamus. Wagenvoort based his case on unattested individuals («Wagenvoort thought Neaera was Sulpicia and Lygdamus her betrothed, an unattested son of an unattested brother of her father», p. 53); Butrica, on the other hand, proposes Ser. Sulpicius Postumius, the brother of the poetess Sulpicia and nephew of Messalla, historically attested by Frontin. *Aq.* 99.4. In the choice of the pseudonym *Lygdamus*, the name of a slave (*servus*) which was featured prominently in the work of a contemporary elegiac poet (cf. Prop. 3.6; 4.7; 4.8), Postumius is making a veiled reference to his own *praenomen* (*Servius*). Be that as it may, pseudonyms in Latin elegy are regularly based on the *nomina* rather than *praenomina*.

[42] cf. De la Ville de Mirmont, *op. cit.* (n. 38), pp. 56 ff., reviewing and rebutting these theories.

[43] A bizarre hypothesis defended by L. Herrmann, in whose view the *Ibis* was also by Caesius Bassus, in a succession of articles: "Le pseudo-Lygdamus", *Latomus* 23 (1964) 726–749; "La date et l'auteur du *Contre Ibis*", *Latomus* 24 (1965) 274–295 (esp. 290–291); "Secrets et structure du *Contre Ibis*", *Latomus* 27 (1968) 843–851. Herrmann goes so far as to detect clear acrostics in *Corp. Tib.* 3.6.14–16; 3.6.5–7; 3.5.4–6 and 3.3.4–8, forming the name of the poet Caius Caesius (Bassus), although to this end several words in the transmitted text have to be emended; L. Herrmann, *L'âge d'argent doré*, Paris: PUF, 1951.

[44] F. della Corte, "Il Poeta Lucio Giulio Cálido", *RCCM* 7 (1965), Mélanges Schiaffini, pp. 416–431. As for the dating of the controversial autobiographical pentameter, Della Corte can only place it some time between 82 and 43 BC.

[45] *De Lygdami carminibus*, Detmoldae 1872 (= Neustettin 1875).

[46] *De Lygdami carminibus*, Neustettin 1876.

(1835)[47] the man in question is neither a Greek nor a freedman, but a well-to-do Roman and friend of Tibullus; in the opinion of W. S. Teuffel (1853)[48] he is a young Roman and imitator of Tibullus; for E. Hiller (1883),[49] an Albius, a young relative of Tibullus, who decided to Hellenize his name—according to W. Y. Sellar (1899)[50]—to distinguish himself 'artistically' from his famous relation; Ed. Hailer (1891),[51] in view of a series of grammatical and stylistic peculiarities (eg *quamvis* + indicative) which are not to be found in Tibullus but are in Propertius, sees in Lygdamus an imitator of Propertius, thus clearing a path for J. P. Postgate (1909),[52] who eventually identifies him with the slave of the same name belonging to Cynthia (cf. Prop. 3.6.2; 11; 24; 31; 36; 42) and Propertius (cf. Prop. 4.7.35; 8.37; 68; 70; 79); he was followed in turn by L. Alfonsi (1946),[53] according to whom the slave Lygdamus, thanks to the poetic *sodalicium* between his master Propertius—for Alfonsi mistakenly considers him to be a slave of Propertius himself—and Ovid (cf. Prop. 3.6), became a friend of the latter and, now a poet himself, followed in the wake of the poet from Sulmo, the great colleague and friend of his ex-master;[54] O. Ribbeck (1868),[55] after observing certain syntactic and metrical analogies between the elegies of Lygdamus and the pseudo-Virgilian *Catalepton* 11, comes to the conclusion that they are the work of the same author; in the view of H. de la Ville de Mirmont (1904),[56] the pseudonym of *Lygdamus* conceals a Roman citizen, a pupil of

---

[47] *Albii Tibulli carmina ex recensione Car. Lachmanni passim mutata*, Gottingae 1835, I, p. XXXI.

[48] *op. cit.* (n. 24) 344.

[49] "Die Tibullische Elegiensammlung", *Hermes* 18 (1883) 343 ff.

[50] *The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age, Horace and the Elegiac Poets*, Oxford 1899 (repr. New York 1965) 250 ff.

[51] "Wer ist der Verfasser der Elegien des Lygdamus?", *Abhandlungen ... W. Christ zum sechzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht von seinen Schülern* (München 1891) 404 ff.

[52] *Selections from Tibullus and others*, Oxford 1903, p. XLV (= London: Macmillan 1910², p. L); "On some Tibullian Problems", *CQ* 3 (1909) 131. In the opinion of Postgate, Lygdamus is also the author of the *Appendix Tibulliana*.

[53] *Albio Tibullo e gli autori del 'Corpus Tibullianum'*, Milano 1946, pp. 76–77.

[54] E. Paratore (*Sulla 'Vita Tibulli' e le 'Vitae Vergilianae'*, Roma 1947, p. 3 n. 2.) demonstrates the fragility of the hypothesis of Alfonsi when he adroitly observes how strange it is, in this case, that Lygdamus should have imitated Ovid a great deal and Tibullus—rival of his ex-master and possibly a personal adversary-considerably, but Propertius very little indeed (cf. also id., *Aevum* 22 [1948] 88).

[55] *Appendix Vergiliana*, Lipsiae 1868, p. 12; *Geschichte der römische Dichtung II: Augusteisches Zeitalter*, Stuttgart 1913² (= 1889), p. 220.

[56] *Le poète Lygdamus. Étude critique, suivie d'une éd. et d'une trad. de Élegies*, Paris 1904, pp. 21 and 62.

Tibullus, whose youthful efforts were eventually collected together with those of Tibullus himself and other poets from the circle of Messalla in the same *Corpus*; for A. CARTAULT (1909),[57] Lygdamus is a Greek freedman (= Voss) and editor of the *Appendix Tibulliana*, called *A. Albius Lygdamus*, because of having been a slave of Tibullus, which would explain the subsequent confusion.

O. TESCARI (1937)[58] states that it is impossible to identify Lygdamus with other famous poets of the period; he lays great stress on his originality and spontaneity, and suggests that it may be Tibullus who is imitating Lygdamus, and not the other way around.[59]

E. PARATORE (1946)[60] not only takes up the theory of the impossibility of identifying Lygdamus with any of the historically known poets but, availing himself of the most radical theories in opposition to the traditional theses, namely those put forward, on the one hand, by AYRMANN and OEBEKE concerning the possibility of interpreting [Tib.] 3.5.18 differently from the identical pentameter in Ovid (*Tr.* 4.10.6), and on the other, those of DE GOLBÉRY and DOINCEUX in understanding *natalem* in the previous Lygdamean hexameter as meaning "anniversary of birth", concludes that the much-debated pentameter of Lygdamus is an allusion to 66 BC, when both *consules designati*, P. Cornelius Sulla and P. Autronius Paetus, accused by the *optimates* of *ambitio*, were stripped of their posts, a memorable histori-

---

[57] *Tibulle et les auteurs du 'Corpus Tibullianum'*, Paris 1909, pp. 74–75, 88: «Lygdamus pouvait être un affranchi de Tibulle. Il a été son élève; né en 43 il a écrit ses vers, qui sont d'un tout jeune homme, au plus tard vers 23; Tibulle a donc pu les lire, les apprécier, les faire connaître dans son entourage. Lygdamus était par là autorisé jusqu'à un certain point à les joindre à ce qu'il avait retrouvé de son maître. Rien ne permet de supposer qu'il ait voulu par une supercherie tromper le public: s'il était un affranchi de Tibulle il s'appelait (A.) Albius (A.) l. Lygdamus. Il a pu mettre son nom en tête de son oeuvre; la confusion s'est produite tout naturellement plus tard, sans qu'il y soit pour rien» (p. 88).

[58] "Tibulliana", *Convivium*, 1937, 549–573; later in his edition of Tibullus, *Tibullo. Elegie*, Milano 1951, pp. 37–44.

[59] A. ROSTAGNI ("Tibulliana", *RFIC*, 1937, 358) demonstrated the weakness of his theory of Tibullus as an imitator of Lygdamus, if 43 BC is maintained as Lygdamus' year of birth (reply by TESCARI in *Convivium*, 1938, p. 239).

[60] First in his review of the book by V. CIAFFI, *Lettura di Tibullo* (Torino 1944), in *Paideia* 1 (1946, pp. 295–300) 299–300; later in his *Storia della letteratura latina*, Firenze 1951, pp. 465–466; in *Sulla Vita Tibulli e le Vitae Vergilianae*, Roma 1947, p. 3 n. 2; and in several articles: "Sul problema dell'identificazione di Ligdamo con Ovidio", *Emerita* 20 (1952) 42–77; "Briciole filologiche", *Studi in onore G. Funaioli*, Roma 1955, pp. 317–353 ("Ancora su Ligdamo e Ovidio", pp. 332–339); "A proposito di due nuovi lavori su Ligdamo", *Aevum* 22 (1948) 278–308; 23 (1949) 85–110; 24 (1950) 291–299; "Spicilegio polemico", *RCCM* 4 (1962) 97–109.

cal event at the time and one mentioned several times by Cicero. Lygdamus was thus "un giovane, oscuro, timido poeta, nato quasi nel medesimo periodo in cui nacquero Cornelio Gallo ed Orazio, vissuto in amicizia con Messalla, un giovane che per la sua timidezza e per l'argomento troppo scopertamente personale della sua poesia avesse fatto ricorso all'uso dello pseudónimo (eccezionale per un poeta elegiaco) e fosse morto in età molto acerba, intorno ai venti anni, dunque prima ancora della nascita di Ovidio". The modest poet Lygdamus thus becomes, in view of the complete absence of information concerning the lost works of Cornelius Gallus, the foundation stone of Roman elegy, and the model imitated by the Augustan poets in general (numerous parallelisms with Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid, but also with Virgil and Horace).

J. P. ENK (1949)[61] insists on the impossibility of identifying Lygdamus with other poets, suggests that scholars should resign themselves to considering him a poet in his own right, describes him as "un lettré de bonne famille, membre du cercle de Messalla; grande poète, non pas, mais fin et délicat" and concludes that "Ovide est l'imitateur de Lygdamus".[62]

In view of this *totum revolutum* it is not surprising that within the Italian school of the 1940s and 50s discordant voices made themselves heard, in an attempt to take up the old Lygdamus = Tibullus equation. The return to pre-Vossian positions at this time[63] began with A. SANTORO (1936) and, after the parenthesis imposed by the war, found continuation in V. CIAFFI (1944);[64] both take up the old thesis of VULPIUS, accepted by HUSCHKE, which considers Tibullus to be only the author of the Lygdamean cycle, but not the protagonist of the love affair: a young man who commissioned Tibullus to compose the cycle. Other supporters of the identification of Lygdamus with

---

[61] "Lygdamus", *REL* 27 (1949) 48–49; "À propos du poète Lygdamus", *Mnemosyne* 3 (1950) 70–75.

[62] W. ERATH (*Die Dichtung des Lygdamus*, Diss. Erlangen-Nuremberg 1971, pp. 297–299) is also of the opinion that Lygdamus was a member of the circle of Messalla and a contemporary of Ovid's, although he feels unable to state who is imitating whom.

[63] In fact, the defence of Tibullan authorship was at no time completely abandoned; cf. PH. AMAT. DE GOLBÉRY, *Albii Tibulli quae supersunt omnia opera*, Parisiis 1826, pp. 473–480 (*De Tibulli vita et carminibus* § III. *Lygdamus*); *id.*, *Défense de Tibulle contre quelques savants qui veulent le vieillir de 15 ans*, Paris 1826; M. W. FUSS, *De elegiarum libro quem Lygdami esse putant quidam*, Klosterneuburg, Münster, 1867.

[64] See n. 6.

Tibullus are G. Vitali (1940),[65] E. V. Marmorale (1946)[66] and L. Pepe (1948).[67] The latter, after defending 66 BC as the date referred to in [Tib.] 3.5.18—the thesis of Paratore, although he does not quote him—, states that Lygdamus is the young Tibullus; the *Albius* of Horace (*Od.* 1.33; *Ep.* 1.4) is simply *Tibullus minor* and his *miserabiles elegi* (*Od.* 1.33.2–3) are the elegies of Lygdamus and the last two of bk. III ([Tib.] 3.19–20); the *immitis Glycera* (*Od.* 1.33.2) is Neaera and the *puella innominata.* Accepting the theses of De Dekker, who dates Horace's Ode 1.33 to the years 33–32 BC,[68] and Rostagni, who dates *Epistula* 1.4 between 35 and 30 BC,[69] Pepe concludes that Tibullus must have written his *iuvenilia* some time before the year 30 BC.[70]

Quae cum ita sint, there is still one last possible line of investigation, which in my view is the most correct one: to consider Lygdamus the imitator of Ovid, that is, to date the Lygdamean cycle as post-Ovidian.[71] The first moves in this direction came from E. Baehrens (1876),[72] E. Kalinka (1898)[73] and F. Calonghi (1901),[74] later followed by F. W. Lenz (1937),[75] L. Herrmann (1951),[76] R. Hanslik (1952)[77] and O. Skutsch (1959).[78]

---

[65] *Albio Tibullo e gli autore del 'Corpus Tibullianum',* Bologna 1940.

[66] "Tibulo nacque nel 66 av. C.", *GIF* 1 (1946) 116–118.

[67] *Tibullo minore,* Napoli: Armani 1948; his views were immediately refuted by E. Paratore, "A proposito di due nuovi lavori su Ligdamo", *Aevum* 22 (1948) 278–308.

[68] J. de Dekker, "Horace et Tibulle", *RPh,* 1937, pp. 30–34.

[69] *La letteratura . . .,* p. 356; "Tibulliana", p. 360.

[70] Also in favour of identifying Lygdamus with Tibullus is L. L. Lousidès, "'Ο Λύγδαμος καὶ αἱ ἐλεγεῖαι αὐτοῦ", *EEATh* 7 (1956–1957) 365–384.

[71] The earliest evidence for such a dating appears to go back to G. Bernhardy, *Grundriß der Römischen Literatur,* Braunschweig 1857³, p. 539. In addition, as early as 1904 the *index* of the *ThLL* classifies the Lygdamus cycle categorically as *Post Ovidium.*

[72] *Tibullische Blätter,* Jena 1876, p. 39.

[73] "Zum *Corpus Tibullianum*", *ZOeG* 49 (1898) 481–490.

[74] "De Lygdamo Ovidii imitatore", *RF* 29 (1901) 273–278.

[75] For the first time in his article "Lygdamus", *RE* 13.2 (1937) 2216: «Daß Lygdamus einen der berühmtesten Verse Ovids zitiert hat, läßt sich bei den zweifellos bestehenden persönlichen Beziehungen zwischen beiden Dichtern verstehen, und es ist denkbar, daß der jüngere dem älteren gerade durch Benutzung dieses Verses ein Kompliment machen und ihm zeigen wollte, wieviel er ihm für sein eigenes Leben verdanke». Subsequently in his last editions of Tibullus; cf. *Tibulli aliorumque carminum libri tres,* Leiden 1959, p. 3: «nihil videtur obstare quominus existemus Lygdamum . . . non indicare primum vitae suae annum sed profiteri veram vitam suam ab Ovidio, cui omnia debeat, originem ducere, cum ipse paulo vel aliquanto post eum natus sit».

[76] *L'âge d'argent doré,* Paris, PUF, 1951, p. 16. Herrmann places his date of birth in 89 or 90 AD. On the assumption that it is impossible that Ovid could have copied anyone, and on the basis of parallelisms with other poets like Persius, Seneca, Martial, Statius, Phaedrus, etc.,—which perforce would date the elegies of

The main obstacle facing the hypothesis that Lygdamus is an imitator of Ovid is a chronological one: if Lygdamus is a peer of Ovid's (or at most one year older) and it is he who is imitating *Tr.* 4.10.6 in Lygd. 5.17, this means that when he wrote his fifth elegy he must have been around 55 or 56 years old (44 or 43 + 11 or 12), given that Ovid's *Tristia*, from which he takes the famous line about the day of birth, were not published in Rome until 11 or 12 AD. Such an advanced age clashes head-on with the description which Lygdamus gives of himself in this same 5th elegy as 'very young' (*iuveni*, l. 6; *modo nata . . . poma*, l. 20).

In order to skirt this obstacle the pioneers in post-Ovidian dating formulated a number of hypotheses:

Kalinka suggested that the 5th elegy should be considered distinct from the Neaera cycle, an idea later taken up by Skutsch.

Calonghi argued for emending the controversial Lygdamean distich (5.18–19) and reading *natalem primo nostri* (vel *primum nostri*) *videre parentes*—variants reflected in some mss. and older editions—, which would have Lygdamus referring to his parents' birthday, making use of the famous line of Ovid.

Lenz and Skutsch do their best to get round this obstacle with the shaky theory that Lygdamus, in including the much-debated autobiographical Ovidian distich, is not in fact attempting to refer to his own date of birth, but to render a heart-felt tribute to his much-admired model, Ovid, while trying to pass his elegy off as an Ovidian *carmen iuvenale*;[79] in the view of Skutsch, the elegies of Lygdamus

---

Lygdamus to post-89 AD—Herrmann attributes the poems to Caesius Bassus (cf. n. 43). He notes, significantly, that the year 69 AD witnessed the death of the two consuls: the emperor Galba and Titius Vinnius; Lygdamus, according to this theory, was a poet invented by Caesius Bassus, who was born in the year 68 AD, and whose elegies—written by Caesius—were a late but clever tribute to the poets of the circle of Messalla.

[77] "Der Dichterkreis des Messalla", *Anzeiger d. Öst. Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien, Phil.-Hist. Kl.* 89 (1952) 22–38: Lygdamus is the pseudonym of a young man from a good family who belongs to the circle of Messalla; as a poet he imitates Ovid and others.

[78] "*Cum cecidit fato consul uterque pari* (III.5.18)", *Philologus* 103 (1959) 152–154: «Die Lösung der Aporie ist erstaunlich einfach. Der Dichter, der frühestens 11 n. Chr. schreibt und behauptet, er sei 43 v. Chr. geboren und noch blutjung, spricht nicht eigentlich von sich selbst, sondern von dem, als dessen Werk er das Gedicht gelesen wissen will. Im vorangehenden und im folgenden Distichon schreibt er absichtlich ganz wie Ovid, und dazwischen stellt er, gewissermassen als Signatur Ovids, das Geburtsjahr 43 v. Chr. (p. 153)»; "Zur Datierung des Lygdamus", *Philologus* 110 (1966) 142–146.

[79] O. Skutsch, *art. sup. cit.* (1959), 153: «Lygdamus der Nachahmer ist; denn bei Ovid steht die Jahresangabe in der Biographie, wo man sie erwartet; bei Lygdamus

were written in the first half of the 1st c. AD, not before the year 11 AD, during the reign of Tiberius, a period when a great interest can be discerned in the production of works passing for *carmina iuvenalia* of the great Roman poets;[80] the 5th elegy does not belong to the Neaera cycle, though it may be the work of the same author.

In an attempt to reconcile the idea of a Lygdamus imitating Ovid with his description of himself as *iuvenis*, W. Kraus (1957)[81] recovered a long-forgotten hypothesis of F. Hennig (1895):[82] the line *cum cecidit*... from the *Tristia* had appeared long beforehand in the first edition of the *Amores* in five books. Accordingly, the date of composition of the 5th elegy of Lygdamus and of the Ovidian borrowing may be brought forward considerably to the year 2 BC, when the *Amores* were published: «Daß wir die Dichtung des Lygdamus beruhigt ins vorletzte Jahrzehnt des letzten Jahrhunderts v. Chr. setzen dürfen, ist vor allem deshalb von Bedeutung, weil wir ihr dadurch ihren historischen Platz innerhalb der Blütezeit der römischen Elegie sichern. Lygdamus ist zwar ein Epigone nach Tibull und Properz, ein Epigone auch im Vergleich zu seinem Altersgenossen Ovid, weil er nicht wie dieser neue Wege geht, aber er hat doch noch Anteil an dem innern Leben der erotischen Elegie, die um 11 n. Chr. längst tot war». Even so, in the year 2 BC Lygdamus would have been around 40 years old, still too old to be properly considered a *iuvenis*.

The most reasonable solution, if we are to reconcile the idea of a post-Ovidian Lygdamus with the youthful Lygdamus of the 5th elegy, is that proposed by B. Hagen (1954),[83] who suggested putting back the poet's year of birth to 69 AD; Lygd. 5.18 would thus refer to a bloody event which occurred on January 15th of that year, when the *consules ordinarii* Servius Galba y Titus Vinnius were assassinated (cf. Tac.

---

steht sie in der Klage, dass er sein Leben so jung verliere, und in einem solchen Zusammenhamng ist ein Datum geschmackswidrig und geradezu absurd. Dazu kommt, dass die Übereinstimmungen mit Ovid in vorangehenden und im folgenden Distichon die Priorität Ovids klar erkennen lassen»; for Lenz, cf. n. 75.

[80] E. Fraenkel (*JRS* 42 [1952] 8) and Sc. Marotti (*Humanitas* 3 [1950] 371 ff.) respectively point to the epyllia *Culex* and *Ciris* as falsifications of Virgil.

[81] "Lygdamus und Ovid", *WS* 70 (1957) 197–204.

[82] "Untersuchungen zu Tibull. Ein Beitrag zur Echtheitsfrage", *Programm des Gymnasiums zu Wittenberg*, Ostern 1895, p. 8.

[83] *Stil und Abfassungszeit der Lygdamusgedichte*, Diss. Hamburg 1954. This proposal was put to the scientific community by U. Knoche, "Tibulls erste Liebeselegie (III.19)?, *Navicula Chiloniensis. Studia philologica F. Jacoby professori Chiloniensi emerito octogenario oblata*, Leiden: Brill 1956, p. 188 n. 1.

Hist. 1.41–42). HAGEN's theory was soon adopted by B. AXELSON (1960)[84] and A. G. LEE (1958–1961),[85] who also provided documentary evidence for Lygdamus' belonging to the Flavian period: imitations, on the one hand, of passages of Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid prevent him from being situated chronologically as a predecessor or contemporary of the great elegiac poets of the Augustan age, while on the other the imitations of Flavian authors like Martial and Statius make it advisable to date the period of his literary production to the last decade of the 1st c. AD, possibly after 95 AD, the date of the first edition of Martial.[86] A detailed examination of the vocabulary of Lygdamus, moreover, reveals some words characteristic of Silver Latin which argue in favour of this late dating: *Erythraeus* (3.17), *Assyria* (2.24), *Castaliamque umbram Pieriosque lacus* (1.16), *Lethaeamque ratem Cimmeriosque lacus* (5.24), *amarantus* (4.33), *anguinea* (4.87). To the lexical arguments (eg the poetic and characteristically Ovidian use of *renovare* = *arare* in Lygd. 3.5; cf. comm. *ad loc.*), I would add a clear literary argument: the peculiar treatment received by the Muses in Lygd. 1—as sources of inspiration (ll. 7–8), as counsellors (ll. 9–14) and above all as messengers (ll. 15–28)—together with the structure of the elegy as a dialogue with no scenic parentheses or introductory formulae—a unique case in Roman love elegy—cannot be understood without a reference to Martial (cf. introd. *ad* Lygd. 1).

Today, the suspicion that we are dealing with a post-Ovidian poet, presumably from the Flavian period, and a scepticism which from

---

[84] "Lygdamus und Ovid. Zur Methodik der literarischen Prioritätsbestimmung", *Eranos* 58 (1960) 93–111 (= *Kleine Schriften zur lateinischen Philologie* [Stockholm 1987] 283–297); "Das Geburtsjahr des Lygdamus. Ein Rätsel der Römischen Elegiendichtung", *Eranos* 58 (1960) 281–297 (= *Kleine Schr. z. lat. Philol.* [Stockholm 1987] 298–309).

[85] "The Date of Lygdamus, and his Relationship to Ovid", *PCPhS* 5 (1958–1959, although published in 1961) 15–22.

[86] The theory of the Flavian dating of Lygdamus came up almost immediately against the severe criticism of E. PARATORE, "Spicilegio polemico", *RCCM* 4 (1962) 65–116 ("VII: ancora di Ligdamo e Ovidio") and K. BÜCHNER, "Les elegies de Lygdamus", *Hermes* 93 (1965) 65–112, 503–508 (112: «Lygdamus ist ein dilettant des 2. Jahrzehntes v. Chr.»); nor was it accepted by F. DELLA CORTE, "Alle origini del *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Studi su Varrone sulla retorica, storiografia e poesia latina. Scritti in onore di Benedetto Riposati*, Centro di Studi Varroniani, Rieti 1979, pp. 145–146 (= *Opuscula VII, Publicazioni dell'Istituto di Filologia Classica e Medioevale* 77, Università di Genova, Facoltà di Lettere, 1983, pp. 93–94). On the other hand, it has recently found a favourable reception in the work of H. TRÄNKLE, *Appendix Tibulliana*, Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter 1990, pp. 57–63.

the outset condemns any attempt at identification to failure[87] would appear to be the two predominant attitudes among critics of the work of Lygdamus.

It should therefore be made clear, in the interests of a better understanding of the present commentary, that I consider Lygdamus to be a post-Ovidian author and imitator of Ovid belonging to the Flavian period, with his literary *acmé* at the end of the 1st c. AD; as for his historical identity, it seems an illusory and impossible task to attempt to pin it down; suffice it to say that the elegiac genre does not die with Ovid, but continues to be cultivated, although admittedly its creative impulse weakens; through Pliny the Younger (*Ep.* 6.15; 9.22) we know of the existence in the 2nd half of the 1st c. AD of a direct descendant of Propertius, a man called Passenus Paulus, who composed elegies in imitation of his forebear, which at least demonstrates—and without any desire to identify him with Lygdamus—that the genre was still being worked during this period.

[87] M. E. Hubbard, "Lygdamus", *OCD*, 1970, p. 630: «No attempt to identify Lygdamus himself carries any conviction, and the preservation in the Tibullian corpus of a poet who apparently pretends to be Ovid (5.18) is a puzzle».

2. LYGDAMUS AND NEAERA

After the *vexata quaestio* of the identification of Lygdamus and the dating of the poetic cycle, the topic which has most interested critics of the work is the relationship between Lygdamus and Neaera.

The author of the six elegies under study only names himself once, in 2.29, where he gives himself the name *Lygdamus*. All the elegies, except the 5th, are dedicated to one woman, whom he calls *Neaera*. Both names are almost certainly pseudonyms and they have often been thought to have been deliberately chosen, like the names of Delia and Nemesis in Tibullus, and Cynthia in Propertius.

Lygdamus is a common slave's name in Rome, as is attested by the elegies of Propertius (3.6.2; 4.7.35) and the inscriptions. *Lygdamus* and *Cerinthus* in the Sulpicia cycle are the only examples of male lovers designated by means of pseudonyms. It seems clear that the author, in using this pseudonym of a slave, is aiming to present himself to his beloved as the "slave of love", in accordance with the elegiac topos of *servitium amoris*. It is also tempting to think that the choice of this name in preference to any other of the many slave names available is due to the element of colour it conjures up, "white as marble", following another equally elegiac topos, that of the paleness of the face as a *signum amoris*.

The name of *Neaera* is also a reference to the Greek world, both to the exotic ambit of myth (the nymphs) and to the more prosaic 'low life' (the Athenian hetairai).[1] Perhaps our author actually intended to echo by means of this ambivalent name the dual character of Neaera in the cycle: chaste and perfidious, *coniunx* and *soror*, object of love and contempt at the same time.

In contrast to the great elegiac poets, we do not witness in Lygdamus the familiar phase-by-phase evolution of the elegiac amatory relationship (falling in love—conquest—passionate, requited love—betrayal and jealousy—*discidium*—reconciliation—final *discidium*). We are presented,

---

[1] Cf. R. Rocca, "Tibullo", *Dizionario degli scrittori Greci e Latini*, F. della Corte (ed.), Settimo Milanese: Marzorati 1990, vol. 3, p. 2249: «da scelta del nome Neera rivela un'allusione all'ambiente delle etere ateniesi». G. Baligan (*art. cit.* [n. 29: 1948], pp. 1–36), on the basis of Verg. *Ecl.* 3.3–4, Hor. *Epod.* 15.23, Ov. *Am.* 3.6.28, would see in *Neaera* the typical pseudonym of the unfaithful beloved (refuted by E. Paratore, *art. cit.* [n. 29: 1948], pp. 87–88).

ex abrupto, with a traumatic situation of *discidium*. This leaves a deep mark on the poetry of Lygdamus, imprinting a strong self-pitying tone on the whole collection. What is missing is the cry of joy from the love-smitten individual whose love is requited and who knows and feels he is king, the happy, jubilant song of full elegiac love—understanding by 'elegiac love' here the absolute love dreamed of and longed for by the elegiac poets: requited love, not the harsh reality it was their lot to live through and suffer-which at times makes an appearance—if only a fleeting one—in the bulky collections of the other elegiac poets, where we are witness to the complete cycle of the amatory relationship (cf. eg Catul. 5 and 7; the billets-doux of Sulpicia; Prop. 2.14 and 15). In this connection, it is sufficient to read the third elegy: the 'elegiac' affirmation made there by Lygdamus that true happiness—or wealth—lies in the beloved (without her, it is preferable to be dead) stems precisely from a situation of *discidium*, not of happiness.

As regards the nature of the Lygdamus-Neaera relationship, we may make reference to three basic interpretations among modern critics:[2]

a) Lygdamus and Neaera were married.[3] Terms such as *coniunx* (3.1; 26–27; 2.4; 30; 3.32), *vir* (= *maritus* in 1.23; 2.14) and *coniugium* (4.74; 79) support this thesis, as does Lygd. 4.60, *nec gaudet casta nupta Neaera domo*, particularly in view of the use of *nubere*. Besides, in 3.33–34, Lygdamus, implores the aid, not only of Venus, but of Juno, the patron-goddess of matrimony (*Iuno Cinxia*, *Iuno Iuga* or *Iuno Gamelia*, Gr. Ἥρα Ζυγία). All this, in addition to the frequent allusions to family relationships (cf. 2.13–14, *sed veniat carae matris comitata dolore: / maereat haec genero, maereat illa viro*; 4.51, *tantum cara tibi, quantum nec filia matri*; 92–94, *sed culta et duris non habitanda domus / et longe ante alias*

[2] The nature of the relationship between Lygdamus and Neaera and its connection with the temporal past-present-future axis depends in large measure on how we interpret Lygd. 1.12 (*vir quondam, nunc frater*) and 26 (*sive sibi coniunx, sive futura soror*), and in particular on the value of past or future that we give to the ambiguous *quondam* of l. 12 ("once" or "one day").

[3] In the past, this was the opinion of MURETUS (pp. 97–98), BROUKHUSIUS (p. 295), DE GOLBÉRY (pp. 192–193) and DISSEN (p. 323); more recently this view has been shared by O. TESCARI (*art. cit.* [n. 58], p. 560; *op. cit.* [n. 58], pp. 44–45), G. BALIGAN (*art. cit.* [n. 29: 1948], pp. 9–11; *art. cit.* [n. 29: 1950] 277–279), A. LA PENNA (*art. cit.* [n. 31: 1949], p. 115; *art. cit.* [n. 31: 1951] p. 64; *art. cit.* [n. 31: 1953] 107), H. TRÄNKLE (*op. cit.* [n. 84], pp. 56–57). In the view of BALIGAN (*ll. cc.*) Lygdamus and Neaera are not only married but are first cousins (*fratres [patrueles]*), an idea previously put forward by MURETUS in his *editio Tibulliana* of 1559 (*l. c.*).

omnes mitissima mater / isque pater, quo non alter amabilior), goes to make up a warm and intimate atmosphere that is totally different from that surrounding Cynthia and Propertius, Delia and Tibullus, or Corinna and Ovid, and which can only be understood within the setting of a matrimonial relationship. However, the nature of this relationship would go against the whole elegiac tradition: the amatory relationship between the elegiac poet and his beloved is always one of complete freedom.

b) Lygdamus and Neaera were lovers.[4] The conjugal terms can easily be explained, first of all in accordance with the well-known elegiac fiction of dressing up the free love relationship with the solemnity of a *foedus amoris* similar to that of the marriage bond, and secondly if we consider that the innermost aspiration harboured by Lygdamus is to make Neaera his spouse. In fact, in the elegy there is evidence of the use of terms like *soror* as equivalent to "beloved", *vir* and *coniunx* to "lover", and *coniugium* to "love bond" (in a parallel manner *adulterium* = "infidelity"). In 1.23 *vir* is opposed to *frater* (= "lover"), thus conserving its proper meaning of "husband", the condition to which Lygdamus aspires: *coniugis ereptae* (2.30), *coniuge* (3.32), *nupta Neaera* (4.60), *genero* (2.14) reflect the poet's dream. *Futura coniunx, potius coniunx* (1.26 and 27) and the fact that Apollo promises him *coniugium* (4.79–80) support this hypothesis.

c) Lygdamus and Neaera were betrothed (*sponsi*).[5] *Coniunx* and *gener* are terms which in addition to indicating a state of matrimony, may denote not only an illegitimate union, but also the prematrimonial stage of courtship. These senses are already attested in the Latin poets of the Augustan age; for *gener*, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.344–346 (applied to Coroebus, a simple aspirant to the hand of Cassandra), *et gener auxilium Priamo Phrygibusque ferebat, / infelix, qui non sponsae praecepta furentis / audierit*; for *coniunx*, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 9.138 (Turnus referring to

---

[4] This is is the thesis of a number of critics, both early (eg Lipsius, Ach. Statius 200, Vulpius 217, Heyne 193), and modern: A. Cartault (*Tibulle et les auteurs*... [Paris 1909] 71), L. Alfonsi (*Albio Tibulli e gli autori*... [Milano 1946] 62–63), L. Pepe (*Tibullo minore*, Napoli 1948, 13 n. 1).

[5] This is the thesis of Voss, Guglielmino, Salanitro, Ponchont (p. 120); E. Paratore ("A proposito de due nuovi lavori su Ligdamo", *Aevum* 22 [1948] 301-302; "Sul problema dell' identificazione di Ligdamo", *Emerita* 20 [1952] 53-54); F. Della Corte, "Aspetti sociali del III. libro del *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Synteleia Vincenzo Arangio-Ruiz*, a cura di A. Guarino e L. Labruna, Napoli 1964, pp. 690–695 (= *Opuscula* III, Istituto di Filologia Classica e Medioevale, Università di Genova, Facoltà di Lettere, 1972, pp. 191–196).

Lavinia), *coniuge praerepta*; Ov. *Her.* 8.86, *abducta viduum coniuge flere virum.* This passage of Ovid is important, because it not only confirms that *coniunx* was used, at least by the poets, in the sense of "promised one", but it also reveals a usage not attested by the lexicographers, that of *vir* in the sense of *sponsus.* Lygdamus uses the terms *coniunx*, *gener* and *vir* in connection with a simple promise of matrimony. This easily explains the family atmosphere that pervades the relationship between Lygdamus and Neaera without any need to appeal to the institution of marriage.

3. THE CONFIGURATION OF THE *CORPVS TIBVLLIANVM*

To the best of our knowledge, the elegies of Lygdamus were never published as a separate book, but have always formed part of the so-called *Corpus Tibullianum.*

This *Corpus*, as it has come down to us from the medieval manuscript tradition, is made up of three books of elegies transmitted under the name of Tibullus. Alongside the first two books, *Delia* and *Nemesis*, which are undoubtedly genuine works of Tibullus, the *Corpus* is completed by a miscellaneous collection of poems of varying merit and of extremely dubious authorship, which have given rise to the *vexata quaestio* of book III of Tibullus.

Book III opens with the six short elegies of Lygdamus. They are followed by the *Panegyricus Messallae*, a hexametrical composition of little literary merit: the praises of a client in search of money. Then come eleven short poems (3.8–18) on the love of Sulpicia, niece and ward of Messalla, for Cerinthus, which are traditionally divided into two groups, of five and six respectively, since it is generally accepted that they are by different hands: the second series, moving in its spontaneity, sincerity and originality, is possibly the work of Sulpicia herself; the first, which reveals knowledge of the other series, is the work of some important poet from the circle of Messalla, whose identity is unknown to us. The *Corpus* is closed by poems 19 and 20, the short cycle of the *puella innominata*, probably youthful works of Tibullus.

Once the Tibullan authorship of book III, or a good part of it, had been placed in doubt at the end of the 18th century, it became necessary to explain how the *Corpus Tibullianum* was formed, that is: what explanation can be offered for the fact that the elegies of Lygdamus, Cerinthus and Sulpicia, as well as the *Panegyricus Messallae*, should become so closely linked to the two genuine books of Tibullus, to the point of being regarded as genuine Tibullan works for several centuries? And at what date can the *Corpus Tibullianum* be stated to have acquired its definitive length and configuration?

The theory that has dominated Lygdamean criticism for some time holds that Book III is the "book of the poets of the Messallan circle" (E. Norden): to the books by this circle's most distinguished poet,

Tibullus, were presumably added, at an unspecified date, some unedited papers left by Tibullus himself on his death as well as compositions by other, minor, poets of the circle, these papers coming from the personal archive of Messalla Corvinus.[1]

CARTAULT[2] believed that the complete edition of the *Corpus* was the responsibility of Lygdamus, a freedman of Tibullus, at a date not after 23 BC.[3]

However, the fact that certain compositions depict the illicit love of Messalla's niece for one Cerinthus makes it quite inconceivable, according to PONCHONT,[4] that they could have been published before Messalla's death in 8 AD, and this date is therefore proposed as the *terminus post quem*; the publication of the complete *Corpus* would therefore have taken place in the course of the 1st c. AD, between the time of Tiberius and that of Domitian, that is, between Ovid and Martial.[5]

BAEHRENS[6] dated publication to the reign of Claudius, around the middle of the 1st c. AD, on the grounds that the tragedies of Seneca contain a number of imitations of Lygdamus.

Nevertheless, with any of these hypotheses—publication in the Augustan, Claudian or Flavian period—it would be difficult to explain why there is no documentary evidence of Lygdamus and his cycle of poems in any of the other Latin authors; it is striking that Ovid in *Am.* 3.9, Suetonius in the *Vita Tibulli*, and Martial in 8.73.7 and 14.193 refer to the first two books of Tibullus, but make no mention at all of Lygdamus; similarly, later writers and grammarians

---

[1] A theory first proposed by C. LACHMANN (*Kl. Schriften* II, pp. 150 ff.), rapidly taken up by other scholars such as HAASE, BAEHRENS, HILLER, RIBBECK, and KALINKA; cf. A. CARTAULT, *À propos du Corpus Tibullianum* (Paris: Alcan, 1906) 222–223; B. RIPOSATI, *Introduzione allo studio di Tibullo*, Milano 1968[2], pp. 80–81 (= Como-Milano [1945] 80–81).

[2] *À propos du Corpus Tib.* (Paris 1906) 180; *Tibulle et les auteurs du Corp Tib.* (Paris 1909) 88.

[3] This hypothesis had already been put forward by TEUFFEL, *Studien und Charakteristiken*, Leipzig 1871, pp. 344 ff.

[4] *Tibulle* (1968) 127–128.

[5] Cf. M. SCHANZ-C. HOSIUS, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* II, *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* VIII.2, München 1935, pp. 178–179; B. RIPOSATI, *Introduzione allo studio di Tibullo*, Milano 1968[2], pp. 80–81 (= Como-Milano [1945] 80–81). F. DELLA CORTE (*"Alle origini del Corpus Tibullianum"*, *art. cit.* [n. 86], p. 146 [1979], p. 94 [1983]) points to the second son of Messalla Corvinus, that is, Marcus Aurelius Cotta Maximus—thus named after his adoption by his maternal uncle, Aurelius Cotta, in 9 AD—as the editor of the *Corp. Tib.* in Antiquity (*editio Cottana*).

[6] *Tibullische Blätter*, Jena 1876.

only know the first two books of the *Corpus* (see n. 8 in p. 5).

Moreover, if one favours a post-Ovidian dating for the Lygdamean cycle and other compositions in bk. III, it is obvious that the book can never be considered an anthology of the poets of the literary circle of Messalla, independently of whether its date of publication is Augustan or post-Augustan.

A. ROSTAGNI,[7] in light of the testimony of the *codex Santenianus* (s. IX),[8] which only mentions two books of Tibullus, states that bk. III could not have been added to the other two in the *Corpus* before the 10th century.[9] However, this does not prevent him from declaring the 'Suetonian character' of the *Vita Tibulli* transmitted by the Ambrosian and Vatican codices, or from detecting in the reference to the *epistulae amatoriae* an allusion to the cycle of Cerinthus and Sulpicia, which would imply that bk. III had been known as Tibullan since the generation preceding Suetonius, although it was to remain independent until at least the 10th century.[10]

L. PEPE, in whose view Lygdamus is the young Tibullus, maintains that the elegies of Lygdamus were already part of bk. II of Tibullus when it was published shortly after the poet's death. The fact that other Latin authors do not mention Neaera is irrelevant, since they do not make any mention of Marathus either, and no one doubts that he belongs to bk. I.[11] On the other hand, the *Panegyricus*, the Sulpicia cycle and the last two elegies of the *puella innominata*, which escaped the attention of the editor of the posthumous works, were brought together in the *Appendix* at an unknown date. Against the unanimous manuscript tradition, which divides the *Corpus* into three books and attributes the third to Lygdamus, PEPE detects an

---

[7] "La *Vita* suetoniana di Tibullo e la costituzione del *Corpus Tibullianum*", *RFIC* 13 (1935) 47 ff.

[8] Studied by M. HAUPT, *Hermes* 3, p. 221; *Opuscula* III.2, p. 426.

[9] A thesis followed, among others, by G. BALIGAN, "Il terzo libro del *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Studi pubblicati dal Ist. di Filol. Class. dell' Univ. di Bologna* I (1948) 2–3.

[10] Against the theory of ROSTAGNI, cf. B. RIPOSATI, *Introduzione allo studio di Tibullo*, Milan 1968[2], pp. 80–81 (= Como-Milano [1945] 71–72); E. PARATORE, *Una nuova riconstruzione del 'De poetis' di Suetonio*, Bari 1950, pp. 294 ff., 342 and 344 ff.

[11] Cf. B. RIPOSATI, *Introduzione allo studio di Albio Tibulo*, Milano 1968[2], p. 81 (= Como-Milano [1946] 72): «Che gli antichi in genere citassero di preferenza il primo e il secondo libro della silloge, trascurando il terzo, non deve far meraviglia: il Tibullo della tradizione, quello che "a giudizio di molti teneva il primo posto fra gli elegiaci romani", era per loro, ed è per noi, soltanto il tenero cantore di Delia e di Nemesi».

older tradition in which the Lygdamaean cycle belonged to bk. II.[12] The theory is that on this older manuscript tradition was superimposed another branch of the tradition in the 13th or 14th century, with Lygdamus now forming part of bk. III thanks to a copyist who was surprised by the fact that the elegies of Tibullus were accompanied by those of a poet calling himself Lygdamus. PEPE adds that the restoration of the elegies of Lygdamus to book II eliminates the disproportion between the first two books (820 : 428 [+ 290 = 718]) which prompted TH. BIRT[13] to formulate the ingenious hypothesis that the *liber Lygdami*, although presented to Neaera in a separate edition, was added by the editors (the *Sosii fratres bibliopolae*) to the second book to compensate for its brevity, thus causing Lygdamus to lose an individual identity he would not recover until the *volumina* were transferred to the *codices*, when some copyist, on observing that it was not Tibullus who had written the Neaera elegies, accordingly placed them at the beginning of book III.[14]

For H. TRÄNKLE[15] the theory of bk. III as that of the poets of Messalla's circle could only be valid if all (or almost all) the items in bk. III had been composed in Messalla's lifetime, a dating increasingly questioned by the critics and rejected outright by Tränkle for the majority of the compositions:

- III.1–6 (Lygdamus): after Ovid's late works, not before 20 AD; Tränkle: end of the 1st c. AD.
- III.7 (*Panegyricus Messallae*): after Ovid's late works, perhaps even considerably later; Tränkle: 2nd c. AD.
- III.8–12 (Cerinthus): almost certainly immediately after the late works of Ovid.

---

[12] In fact in the *codex Nostradamensis* (s. XIII), which contains the *Florilegium Gallicum*, the fragments of bk. III are labelled *In eodem*, in reference to Bk. II; VINCENT DE BEAUVAIS in his *De eruditione filiorum nobilium* (1245–1249) quotes passages of Lygdamus as belonging to Bk. II (these two facts were already to be found in L. ALFONSI, *Albio Tibullo* . . . [Milano 1946] 73–75). In the *codex Santenianus* (s. IX) of the Royal Library of Berlin, which contains an old library catalogue, the only indication is: *Albi Tibulli lib. II.*

[13] *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Literatur*, Berlin 1882, pp. 426 ff.; cf. also R. ULLRICH, *Studia Tibulliana. De libri secundi editione*, Diss. Berolini 1889; "De libri secundi Tibulliani statu integro et compositione", *Jahrbuch für class. Philol.* 17 (1890) pp. 383 ff.

[14] The theories of PEPE and BIRT on the configuration of Bk. III are refuted by E. PARATORE, "A proposito di due nuovi lavori su Ligdamo", *Aevum* 22 (1948) 281–291.

[15] *Appendix Tibulliana*, Heidelberg 1990, pp. 1–6.

- III.13–18 (Sulpicia): probably written between 25 and 20 BC. The oldest compositions in bk. III, and even older than the poems of bk. II.
- III.19: falsification under the name of Tibullus, most unlikely to have been written before Ovid's *Remedia* and perhaps not until after the *Tristia*, that is, not before 2 AD, or even later.
- III.20: only a rough dating can be given for this short epigram; it is most unlikely to have been written before bk. II of Tibullus.

With the exception of the elegies of Sulpicia, all the poems of bk. III were written sometime after the death of Messalla (8 AD).

The *Corpus* can only have acquired its present length during the 2nd c. AD, given that neither Lygdamus nor the *Panegyricus* previously existed. The poems of bk. III were gradually incorporated into the collection of genuine Tibullan works, and for different reasons, either because Tibullus is named in them (3.19), or because they reflect real circumstances that could have been his (*Panegyricus*), or else because of striking coincidences of form or content (Lygdamus, Cerinthus). The elegies of Sulpicia—the only ones from the Augustan period—would have been incorporated into the *Corpus* through the Cerinthus cycle, with which it had been associated previously and formed a small collection. The first compositions to be added to the initial two books were precisely those of Sulpicia and Cerinthus, which had already been brought together. Lygdamus was probably exposed to the *Corpus* at this stage.

The first clear evidence of the *Corpus* as we know it today is from the 2nd half of the 4th c. AD, in the form of echoes in the poems of Ausonius[16] and Avienus,[17] and in some inscriptions.[18] The grammarians do not quote from bk. III, which is not particularly surprising, since they also pay scant attention to the genuine books, I and II. Therefore, the *Corpus* with the addition of the appendix must have been in circulation by around 350 AD, although there are signs

[16] Aus. *Eph.* 3.72 ≈ Tib. 1.1.59; Aus. *Techn.* 3.2 ≈ Tib. 2.6.19–20; Aus. *Epigr.* 54.1 ≈ [Tib.] 3.7.121; Aus. *Epigr.* 88.3–4 ≈ [Tib.] 3.19.5–6.

[17] Avien. *Arato* 399–400, *flavos tondentur semina crines / omnia* is reminiscent of both Tib. 2.1.47–48, *rura ferunt messes, calidi cum sideris aestu / deponit flavas annua terras comas*, and [Tib.] 3.7.172, *tondeturque seges maturos annua partus*.

[18] An inscription dated 359 AD (*CLE* 661.1), in addition to its Virgilian echoes, presents a hexameter-ending *praeconia laudis/* from [Tib.] 3.7.177; another from 524 AD (*CLE* 701.3), in addition to echoes of Lucan, contains the striking collocation *Cimmeriosque lacusque* from Lygd. 5.24.

pointing to an earlier date.[19] The *Vita Tibulli*, for its part, offers no help. Both Martial and Statius knew the two genuine books of Tibullus (cf. Mart. 14.193; Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.255 ≈ Tib. 1.1.6; *Theb.* 4.765–766 ≈ Tib. 1.7.26), but no definite conclusions can be drawn regarding certain coincidences with bk. III.[20]

---

[19] In the form of two epitaphs of the imperial period, whose prosodic peculiarities indicate that they were written not before the 2nd half of the 1st c. AD: one (*CLE* 1175), alongside clear echoes of Propertius and the famous Virgilian epitaphs, the existence of which is attested from the early 2nd c. AD, includes a pentameter (l. 6) which imitates Lygd. 4.30 and 66 (cf. also Tib. 1.6.37–38; 2.3.80); the other, apart from a clear echo of Ennius, numerous quotes from Virgil and Ovid and an obvious evocation (l. 27) of Tib. 1.3.58, contains the description of an early-morning appearance of the deified dead man in a dream (ll. 7–30), which is curiously similar to the apparition of Apollo in a dream in Lygd. 4, although the similarities are not linguistic but of content.

[20] It is doubtful whether there is any direct relationship between Lygd. 1.19, *sit nostri mutua cura/*, and Mart. 10.13(20).9, *si nostri mutua cura est/*; rather, the phrase could have occurred to each poet independently (cf. Ov. *Fasti* 2.64, *sit superis . . . mutua cura tui*). As for the striking coincidences between Statius and the *Panegyricus*, it is not clear who is imitating whom.

4. THE MANUSCRIPT TRANSMISSION OF THE *CORPVS TIBVLLIANVM*

The history of the manuscript tradition of the *Lygdami elegiarum liber* is that of the manuscript tradition of the *Corpus Tibullianum* itself, since Lygdamus was always handed down jointly with Tibullus.

The Carolingian Renaissance plays a fundamental role in the transmission of the *Corpus Tibullianum*.[1] After the long silence of the dark years of the High Middle Ages, the first mention of the survival of the *Corpus* is a reference in the catalogue of the library of the Carolingian court at Aachen (c. 790).[2]

On the death of Charlemagne, some of his books were transferred to the libraries of some of the great French monasteries, and among them, in all probability, was the Carolingian codex of Tibullus, or a copy of it. Thus, at some stage in the history of the transmission of the text, perhaps at the time of Theodulf, the Carolingian manuscript, or its copy, was taken to Fleury; from there it went on to Orléans, where it left several traces: we know from ms. *Vat. Lat.*

---

[1] For the history of the transmission of the text of Tibullus, cf. J. M. FISHER, "The Transmission of the *Corpus Tibullianum*", *ANRW* II.30.3 (1981) 1953–1958; M. D. REEVE-R. H. ROUSE, "Tibullus", in L. D. REYNOLDS (ed.), *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics*, Oxford 1983, pp. 420–425; U. PIZZANI, "Il *Corpus Tibullianum* e le sue aporie fra Medioevo e Umanesimo", *Atti del Convegno Internazionale di studi su Albio Tibullo*, Roma 1986, pp. 141–166.

[2] Contained in the so-called *codex Santenianus*, now in Berlin (*Diez. B. Sant. 66*); cf. B. BISCHOFF, *Sammelhandschrift Diez B Sant. 66*, Graz 1973. Among the items in the catalogue contained in the ms. is listed *Albi Tibulli lib. II* (cf. BISCHOFF, *op. cit.*, p. 39). According to B. L. ULLMAN ("A List of Classical MSS [in an Eighth Century Codex] perhaps from Corbie", *Scriptorium* 8 [1954] 26) this is simply a mistake for *lib. III*; in the opinion of A. ROSTAGNI ("La *Vita* suetoniana di Tibullo e la costituzione del *Corpus Tibullianum*", *RFIC* 13 (1935) 47 ff. [= *Scritti minori* 2.2, Torino 1956, pp. 335–337]) it is a clear sign that in the 9th c. bk. III had still not been added to the two genuine books by Tibullus; others, however, see proof here of either the original coincidence of the present bks. II and III in a single book (restoring the balance in the number of lines between bk. I and bk. II + III, according to BIRT, *loc. cit.* [p. 28 n. 13]), or else the existence of an older edition containing only the two genuine books and distinct from the edition of the *Corpus* which is the basis for our tradition (cf. F. DELLA CORTE, "Alle origini del *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Studi in onore B. Riposati*, Rieti 1979, p. 144 and 151). The identification of the catalogue in the *codex Santenianus* with that of the Carolingian Library is defended by B. BISCHOFF, "Hadoardus and the Classical MSS from Corbie", *Didascaliae. Studies in Honour of Anselm M. Albareda* (New York 1961) 57; *id.*, "Die Hofbibliothek Karls des Großen", *Karl der Große*, B. BISCHOFF-W. BRAUNFELS (edd.), v. II *Das geistige Leben* (Düsseldorf 1965), p. 43 n. 11.

4929 that the text of Tibullus was there at the end of the 11th and even during the 12th century.[3]

From this Carolingian codex are derived, directly or indirectly, the numerous *florilegia* that constituted the vehicle of transmission for the *Corpus* during the Middle Ages, even if only fragmentarily. The florilegia preserved today are our earliest testimony, albeit incomplete, of the text of Tibullus (a few lines of Lygdamus also survive in this way):[4]

1) The *Excerpta Frisingensia*, 10th or early 11th c., once in Freising and today in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich (*Clm. 6292–II*). They derive directly from the Carolingian codex and were presumably compiled for didactic purposes. They comprise only 48 lines or fragments of lines.[5]
2) The *Excerpta Veneta*, compiled in Montecassino by Lorenzo d'Amalfi, tutor to the future pope Gregory VII, in the 11th c., and today in the Biblioteca Marciana in Venice (*Marc. Lat. Z. 497, coll. 1811*). They probably stem from the Carolingian manuscript or its copy in Fleury, although this is by no means certain.[6]
3) The *Florilegium Gallicum*, preserved in four mss. of French origin, which can be dated to sometime between the end of the 12th c. and the beginning of the 14th: *Parisin. Bibl. Nat. lat. 7647* (olim *Thuaneus*), *Paris. Bibl. Nat. lat. 17903* (olim *Nostradamensis* 188), *Arras. 64* (olim *65*), *Escorialensis Q.I.14*. They all stem from a common

---

[3] C. Barlow, "Codex Vaticanus latinus 4929", *MAAR* 15 (1938) 106, 109.

[4] B. L. Ullman, "Tibullus in the Mediaeval *Florilegia*", *CPh* 23 (1928) 128–174.

[5] Published in their entirety by L. Müller, "Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Tibull im Mittelalter", *NJb* 99 (1869) 63–77; the text can also be consulted on p. VIII of the *Praefatio* to his *editio Tibulliana* (Leipzig 1870). For a more recent collation, see the article by F. L. Newton cited in the following note. On the *Excerpta Frisingensia*, see also E. Protzen, *De excerptis Tibullianis*, Diss. Greisfwald 1899, pp. 1–20; E. Klug, *De florilegiis codicis Monacensis 6292 et codicis Trevirensis 1092*, Greifswald, 1913, pp. 3–17; B. Munk Olsen, "Les classiques latins dans les florilèges médiévaux antérieurs au XIIIe siècle", *RHT* 9 (1979) 119–120 (§ 58); M. D. Reeve-R. H. Rouse, "Tibullus", in L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Text and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics*, Oxford 1983, pp. 241, 328–321, 421.

[6] On these two *Florilegia*, the *Excerpta Frisingensia* and the *Excerpta Veneta*, cf. F. L. Newton, "Tibullus in two Grammatical *Florilegia* in the Middle Ages", *TAPhA* 93 (1962) 253–286; a new collation of the *Exc. Fris.* on pp. 257–258; on the source of the *Exc. Ven.*, cf. pp. 281–283 (text reproduced on p. 267). On the *Exc. Ven.*, cf. also B. Munk Olsen, "Les classiques latins dans les florièges médiévaux antérieurs au XIIIe siècle", *RHT* 10 (1980) 119 (§ 67); M. D. Reeve-R. H. Rouse, "Tibullus", in L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Text and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics*, Oxford 1983, pp. 193, 221, 423.

archetype which Ullman places in the 12th c., probably the codex compiled in Orléans in the middle of the century.[7] Although they contain many more lines than the other florilegia (some 250), their value for the textual critic is not as great, since the compiler, more intent on moral than grammatical ends, has freely adapted the text, thereby disfiguring it.

4) Nine shorter and later French *florilegia* containing brief extracts from Tibullus. Their content and origin would seem to indicate that they were students' manuals for the teaching of verse composition. They are not directly derived from the *Florilegium Gallicum*, since they contain lines that do not appear in the latter, but from a common archetype.[8]

As an indication of the important role of these *florilegia* in disseminating the *Corpus*, we know that one of the copies of the *Florilegium Gallicum*, the *codex Nostradamensis* (Paris. 17903, s. XII), provided the 13th century scholar Vincent de Beauvais with the necessary knowledge of Tibullus for his encyclopedia *Speculum maius*.[9]

As regards the transmission of the complete text, we know that in the middle of the 13th c. there was a copy of Tibullus, in all likelihood a copy of the Orléans codex,[10] in the library of Richard de

[7] B. L. Ullman, "Tibullus in the Mediaeval *Florilegia*", *CPh* 23 (1928) 128–174; cf. also G. Meyncke, "Die Pariser Tibullexcerpte", *RhM* 25 (1870) 369–392; 452–453 (an edition of the *Thuaneus* and the *Nostradamensis*); A. Gagnér, *Florilegium Gallicum*, Lund 1936; J. Hamacher, *Das Florilegium Gallicum*, in *Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters* 5, Bern-Frankfurt 1975; B. Munk Olsen, "Les classiques latins dans les florilèges médiévaux antérieurs au XIIIe siècle", *RHT* 9 (1979) 75–83 (with copious bibliography on p. 75); R. H. Rouse, "*Florilegia* and Latin Classical Authors in Twelfth- and Thirteenth Century Orléans", *Viator, Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 10 (1979) 131–160; R. Burton, *Classical Poets in the 'Florilegium Gallicum'*, in *Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters* 14, Bern-Frankfurt 1983; M. D. Reeve-R. H. Rouse, "Tibullus", in L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics*, Oxford 1983, pp. 421–425 *et passim* (cf. ind., p. 480, s.v.).

[8] B. L. Ullman, "Tibullus in the Mediaeval *Florilegia*", *CPh* 23 (1928) 162 ff.; D. M. Robathan, "The Missing Folios of the Paris Florilegium 15155", *CPh* 33 (1938) 195–196; J. Hamacher, *Das Florilegium Gallicum*, Frankfurt 1975, pp. 92–100.

[9] O. Richter (*De Vincentii Bellovacensis excerptis Tibullianis*, Bonn 1865) suggested that Vincent de Beauvais was the author of the *florilegium*; his hypothesis is rejected by B. L. Ullman in "Tibullus in the Mediaeval *Florilegia*", *CPh* 23 (1928) 154–156.

[10] M. D. Reeve-R. H. Rouse, "Tibullus", in L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics*, Oxford 1983, p. 422. In the view of J. M. Fisher ("The Transmission of the *Corpus Tibullianum*", *ANRW* II.30.3 [1981] 1956), even though it is likely that, after the death of Charlemagne, some of his books were transferred to the libraries of some of the great French monasteries, including Corbie, which was only a few kms. from Amiens, where Richard de Fournival was

Fournival, chancellor of Amiens Cathedral, and that on his death in 1260 this copy, together with the other codices from his library, joined the collection of the newly-founded Collège de la Sorbonne.[11] Some extracts from this codex survive in the ms. *Parisin. Lat. 16708* (first quarter of the 15th c.).[12]

But the principal role in the dissemination and survival of the complete text of the *Corpus Tibullianum* fell to the Italian Renaissance. In fact, the oldest preserved ms. containing a complete text of the *Corpus*, and the only pre-15th century one, is a 14th c. codex in the Ambrosian Library in Milan (*Ambros. R. 26 sup*), whose first owner was Coluccio Salutati, notary and chancellor of Florence, and which was probably written in 1374.[13] According to Ullman,[14] the *Ambrosianus* stems from France, perhaps from the copy Richard de Fournival had made of the Carolingian codex, later preserved in the collection of the Collège de la Sorbonne. The *codex Ambrosianus*, which passed from Coluccio's hands to Cosimo de Medici and remained in the hands of this family for some time, is the source for the many 15th and 16th c. mss. which are witness to the popularity of Tibullus during the Renaissance.[15] The whole transmission of Tibullus goes

---

chancellor, it is unlikely that Richard's ms. was copied in Corbie from the Carolingian *codex* that was brought there, since the later catalogues of the Corbie library make no mention of Tibullus (cf. B. Bischoff, "Hadoardus and the Classical MSS from Corbie", *Didascaliae. Studies in Honour of Anselm M. Albareda* [New York 1961] 56). However, Fisher admits that it is «tempting to speculate that there was some connection between Richard's copy and that formerly lodged in Charlemagne's library» (*ibid.*).

[11] B. L. Ullman, "The Sorbonne Library and the Italian Renaissance", *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, Roma 1955, pp. 183–184; cf. R. H. Rouse, "The Early Library of the Sorbonne", *Scriptorium* 21 (1967) 42–71, 227–245; Idem, "Manuscripts Belonging to Richard de Fournival", *RHT* 3 (1973) 253–269; Idem, "*Florilegia* and Latin Classical Authors in Twelfth- and Thirteenth Century Orléans", *Viator, Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 10 (1979) 131–160. The existence of this codex of Tibullus is attested by the catalogue of Richard de Fournival's library, or *Biblionomia* (which lists *Albii Tibullii liber epygrammaton*), and the 1338 Sorbonne catalogue, both published by L. Delisle, *Le cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale*, v. II, Paris 1874, pp. 518–535.

[12] Cf. M. D. Reeve-R. H. Rouse, "Tibullus", *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics*, L. D. Reynolds (ed.), Oxford 1983, p. 422 and n. 10.

[13] E. Baehrens (*Tibullische Blätter* [Jena 1876] 60) surmised that the *Ambrosianus* had been written around 1375; however, the date 1374 has been reinforced by some recent studies; cf. F. Nencini, *Il Tibullo Ambrosiano e la critica Tibulliana*, Milano 1929; H. Tränkle, *Appendix Tibulliana* (Berlin-New York 1990) 7.

[14] B. L. Ullman, "The Sorbonne Library and the Italian Renaissance", *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, Roma 1955, p. 50; *id.*, "A List of Classical MSS (in an Eighth Century Codex) perhaps from Corbie", *Scriptorium* 8 (1954) 31.

[15] B. L. Ullman, "Tibullus in the Mediaeval *Florilegia*", *CPh* 23 (1928) 129; *id.*,

back, then, from Coluccio, via Richard de Fournival, to the court of Charlemagne.

The next oldest codices that can be dated with certainty belong to the third decade of the 15th century: *Paris. Lat. 7989*, written in Florence in 1423,[16] and *Vat. Ottobon. Lat. 1202*, written in 1426 by Lysander Aurispa, also in Florence.[17] From the same place and period, according to the watermark, although offering no precise dating, is the codex *Vat. Lat. 3270*,[18] whose corrector (V^2), as shown by BAEHRENS,[19] made use of another codex, and one no less important for the history of the text: *Guelferbyt. Aug. 82,6*, written not before 1425, apparently by Johannes Jovianus Pontanus.[20] Apparently dating from 1420 or 1421 is *Oxon. Bibl. Bodl. Lat. Class. d. 5 (30059)*,[21] which, as I have had the chance to observe, presents great similarities with *Vat. lat. 2794*, dated 1434. Finally, also among the oldest mss. is the *Eboracensis* of 1425, now lost, but for which we have the collation made at the height of the 17th century by the Latinist N. HEINSIUS, which is preserved in ff. 15–24 of the codex *Berol. Diez B Sant. 55d*.[22]

As regards the survival of Tibullus and the *Corpus Tibullianum* in Italy before the Renaissance boom, it must be said that apart from certain imitations in 8th c. documents,[23] there is only the most absolute silence and obscurity until the beginning of the Renaissance period itself, when two focal points can be detected for the reappearance of Tibullus:

"The Sorbonne Library and the Italian Renaissance", *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, Roma 1955, p. 50; cf. J. M. FISHER, "The transmission of the *Corpus Tibullianum*", *ANRW* II.30.3 (1981) 1957.

16 Cf. A. C. DE LA MARE, "The Return of Petronius to Italy", *Medieval Learning and Literature* (Oxford 1976) 239–251.

17 Cf. R. SABBADINI, *Carteggio di Giovanni Aurispa* (Roma 1931) 183–184.

18 Cf. R. BIANCHI, *Tibullo. Manoscritti e libri a stampa. Catalogo della mostra*, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Maggio-Ottobre 1984, 14, nº 3.

19 In the *praefatio* to his *editio Tibulliana* (Leipzig 1878), pp. VII–VIII; cf. also G. LUCK, *Tibullus* (Stuttgart 1988) VII.

20 Cf. G. GOETZ, "Ueber den Codex Guelferbytanus des Tibull", *RhM* 37 (1882) 141–146; B. L. ULLMAN, *IMU* 2 (1959) 309–335; BUTRICA, *Manuscr. Trad. of Prop.*, p. 209.

21 Cf. the *praefatio* to the edition by G. LUCK (1988), p. V.

22 A transcription was published by H. BELLING, *Quaestiones Tibullianae* (Berlin 1894) 21–25. On the history of this *codex deperditus*, cf. M. D. REEVE, "The *Codex Eboracensis* of Tibullus", *Maia* 25 (1973) 115–116.

23 GUIDO BILLANOVICH, "*Veterum vestigia vatum* nei carmini dei preumanisti Padovani, *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 1 (1958) 175–176.

a) Verona, where lines of Tibullus not contained in the florilegia mentioned above appear not only in an anonymous florilegium entitled *Flores moralium auctoritatum* (Verona 168), written in 1329, but also paraphrased (Tib. 1.7.29–36) in the *De originibus rerum* (88b) of Guglielmo di Pastrengo, a friend of Petrarch[24] who lived in Verona in the 14th century. In the view of SABBADINI,[25] the lost source is a complete text of Tibullus preserved at the time in the capitular library of Verona; in that of MÜLLER,[26] a scholiast of Juvenal; in the opinion of ULLMAN,[27] a more complete florilegium than those preserved today.
b) Padua, where in the 13th c. a group of early humanists grouped round the figure of Lovato Lovati (1241–1309) became familiar with the work of Tibullus as a whole.[28] Lovato might have ob-

---

[24] Petrarch himself, whose irrepressible desire to rediscover the classical authors impelled him to visit the great French libraries in 1333, has been pointed to as responsible for introducing the complete text of Tibullus to Italy. R. SABBADINI (review of the *editio Tibulliana* by K. F. SMITH [New York 1913], *RFIC* 42 [1914] 351) sees in the mention of Delia in Petrarch's verse a sign of the use of a complete ms., since this name does not appear in any of the extant florilegia. However, this knowledge of the work of Tibullus might have come from Ovid, apart from the fact that the collocation *pondus grave* used by Petrarch is a clear echo of the version the florilegia offer of Lygd. 3.11 (*quid prodesse potest pondus grave divitis auri?*), which is different from that of the complete mss. (*nam grave quid prodest pondus mihi divitis auri?*). The most likely answer is that Petrarch was using a more complete florilegium than those that have survived; cf. B. L. ULLMAN, Tibullus in the Mediaeval *Florilegia*", *CPh* 23 (1928) 175–177; *id.*, *Studies in Italian Renaissance*, Roma 1955, pp. 192–194; a hypothesis followed by LENZ in the *Praefatio* to his second edition of Tibullus (Leiden 1964²), p. 10 (= Leiden 1971³, pp. 10–12).

[25] R. SABBADINI, "Le scoperte dei codici Latini e Greci nei secoli XIV e XV", *Biblioteca Storica del Rinascimento* 2, Firenze 1905 (repr. *ibid.* 1967), I, pp. 2 and 16, n. 80; II (1914), p. 93, n. 25. In fact this hypothesis dates back to J. VAHLEN (*Opusc.* I 276–277), who is followed by E. BAEHRENS in the *Praefatio* (p. VI) to his *editio Tibulliana* (Leipzig 1878). The same opinion is shared by H. RÜDIGER in *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung*, ed. H. HUNGER et al., I (1961) 522–525.

[26] In the *praefatio* to his *editio Tibulliana* (Leipzig 1870), p. V. The first four lines of the paraphrase by Guglielmo di Pastrengo of Tib. 1.7.29–36, a fragment completely ignored in the extant florilegia, also appear in the *Scholia Pithoeana* on Juv. *Sat.* 8.29. L. MÜLLER consequently deduces that Pastrengo found the whole passage of Tibullus (1.7.29–36) in the same commentary on Juvenal from which the scholiast took only four lines (1.7.29–32).

[27] B. L. ULLMAN, Tibullus in the Mediaeval *Florilegia*", *CPh* 23 (1928) 172–174; *id.*, *Studies in Italian Renaissance*, Roma 1955, pp. 194–195; a hypothesis followed by LENZ in the *Praefatio* to his second edition of Tibullus (Leiden 1964²), p. 10 (= Leiden 1971³, pp. 10–12) and refuted in his review of the work (*Gnomon* 38 [1966] 39) by H. D. JOCELYN, who was more inclined to accept the theses of MÜLLER and SABBADINI.

[28] GUIDO BILLANOVICH, "*Veterum vestigia vatum* nei carmini dei preumanisti Padovani, *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 1 (1958) 171–179, 202–213 (correspondences with the *Corp. Tibull.*); cf. also U. PIZZANI, "Il *Corp. Tibull.* e le sue aporie fra Medioevo e

tained a complete ms. from the well-stocked library of the monastery of Pomposa,[29] in northern Italy, or else the source might have been the complete text postulated by SABBADINI[30] for nearby Verona.

The boost given to the Renaissance's knowledge of Tibullus by Florence and Padua explains the growing interest in Tibullus from the 15th c., as witness the numerous mss. preserved from the 15th and 16th centuries (over 180), and also the frequency of printed editions following on from the four Venetian *editiones principes* of 1472.

The main source for the scientific reconstruction of the complete text of the *Corpus Tibullianum* is undoubtedly the Italian Renaissance mss., particularly the Vatican (V) and Ambrosian (A) codices mentioned above, the foundation for our modern texts of Tibullus, both first used by BAEHRENS in his 1878 edition, which improved upon the *editio Lachmanniana* of 1829, and initiated the process of the modern reconstruction of the text. In the 20th c., LENZ and CALONGHI increased the number of mss. collated, but many others remain unedited.

Together with the mss. there are another four sources which are of assistance in attaining a greater degree of fidelity in the scientific reconstruction of the text of Tibullus:

a) Quotations and references by the ancient grammarians (Charisius, Diomedes, etc.). This source is of no use in the reconstruction of the text of Lygdamus, since the ancient grammarians never cite bk. III.

b) The above-mentioned florilegia. Even though they are the earliest source we possess, they must be used with a great deal of precaution and scepticism, given the way the text was manipulated by the *excerptores* to pedagogical or moralizing ends.

c) The *Fragmentum Cuiacianum* (F), the only survivor to come from a different branch of transmission from that of the extant mss. of the *Corpus*. It is therefore an extremely valuable tool for the reconstruction of a great part of bk. III. This mutilated codex, now lost, once belonged to the jurist JAC. CUIACIUS (1522–1590) and contained only

Umanesimo", *Atti del Convegno Internazionale di studi su Albio Tibullo*, Roma 1986, pp. 152–155.

[29] GIUSEPPE BILLANOVICH, *I primi umanisti e le tradizioni del classici latini* (Fribourg 1953) 14–24.

[30] J. M. FISHER, "The Transmission of the *Corpus Tibullianum*", *ANRW* II.30.3 (1981) 1958.

bk. III, from Lygd. 4.65. Its own particular readings have been partly preserved thanks to SCALIGER, either in his *Castigationes* (Lutetiae 1577), or in his own marginal notes which can be found in a copy of the 1569 *editio Plantiniana* preserved in Leiden among the collection of JUSTUS LIPSIUS.

d) The earliest editions and commentaries of Tibullus. Since the transmission is so late, the oldest mss., if we leave to one side the *Ambrosianus* (s. XIV), are practically contemporary with the first editions of the poet (15th c.); these editions therefore have a similar and not inconsiderable value for the editor of Tibullus, in that it is reasonable at times to suspect that behind the text of an early edition may lie hidden an older ms. than those extant today. The same goes for the conjectures of the early editors and commentators of Tibullus, who were undoubtedly working from several mss.

The relative recentness of the manuscript tradition has left a deep mark on the whole history of the scientific reconstruction of the *Corpus Tibullianum*, since it brings to centre stage the earliest editions and commentaries, which are virtually contemporary with the oldest mss., and leaves the door open to editorial conjectures, in view of the absence of any proper *antiquiores*. Accordingly, for the present edition of the text of Lygdamus I have not ignored the earliest editors and commentators of the *Corpus*, whose most interesting or apposite readings and conjectures I have attempted to rescue from oblivion; by extension, the same applies to the many other subsequent editors and commentators of Tibullus down to the present day. Finally, it should be added that alongside the most important mss., I have made room, *amore patriae*, for the small number of Spanish mss. of the *Corpus*.

The principal *editiones Tibullianae* to date are the following:

1472 *ed. princeps maior, W. de Spira, Venetiis.*
ed. princeps minor, F. de Comitibus, Venetiis.
ed. princeps tertia vel Pinelliana, Venetiis.
ed. princeps quarta vel Bartoliniana, Venetiis.
1475 *ed. Mediolanensis.*
ed. Romana, cum commentario Bernardini Cyllenii Veronensis.
1481 *ed. Vicentina.*
ed. Regiensis.
1485 *ed. Veneta, cum commentario B. Cyllenii Veronensis.*
1486 *ed. Brixiensis.*
1487 *ed. Veneta, cum commentario B. Cyllenii Veronensis.*
ed. Lipsiensis.

1490 *ed. Lipsiensis altera.*
1491 *ed. Veneta, cum commentario B. Cyllenii Veronensis.*
1493 *ed. Veneta, cum commentario B. Cyllenii Veronensis.*
1500 *ed. Veneta, cum commentario B. Cyllenii Veronensis.*
ed. Lipsiensis.
1502 *ed. Aldina prima.*
1515 *ed. Aldina secunda.*
1551 *ed. Gryphiana, Lugduni.*
1554 *M. A. Muretus, Venetiis.*
1562 *M. A. Muretus, Venetiis.*
1567 *Achilles Statius, quasi ed. Aldina tertia, Venetiis.*
1569 *ed. Plantiniana, cum notis Theod. Pulmanni, Antverpiae.*
1577•1582•1600•1607 *Scaligeri Castigationes, Parisiis.*
1592 *Dousa pater, recogn. Dousa filio, Lugduni Batavorum.*
Horatius Tuscanella, Basileae.
1621 *ed. Iani Gebhardi cum notis Livineii, Francofurti.*
1680 *ed. I. G. Graevio attributa, cum notis Dousae patris, Dousae filii, Scaligeri, Mureti, aliorum, Traiecti ad Rhenum.*
1702 *ed. Cantabrigensis, quam curaverunt Comes Anglesey aliique viri docti cum Bentleio amicitia coniuncti.*
1708 *I. Broukhusius, Amstelodami.*
1749 *I. A. Vulpius, Patavia.*
1755•1777•1798 *edd. Ch. G. Heynii, Lipsiae.*
1811 *J. H. Voss, Heidelbergae.*
1817 *ed. Chr. G. Heynii cum notis E.C.F. Wunderlich et supplemento L. Dissen, Lipsiae.*
1819 *J. G. Huschke, Lipsiae.*
Chr. Bach, Berolini.
1829 *C. Lachmann, Berolini.*
1835 *L. Dissen, Gottingae.*
1853–1868 *edd. M. Haupt, Lipsiae.*
1859 *A. Rossbach, Lipsiae.*
1870 *L. Müller, Lipsiae.*
1878 *E. Baehrens, Lipsiae.*
1879–1904 *edd. J. Vahlen, Lipsiae.*
1885 *E. Hiller, Lipsiae.*
1895 *Ph. Martinon, Lutetiae.*
1897 *H. Belling, Berolini.*
1905 *G. Némethy, Budapestini.*
1905•1914 *edd. J. P. Postgate, Oxonii.*
1909 *A. Cartault, Lutetiae.*

1911 *J. Hartmann, Lugduni Batavorum.*
1913 *K. F. Smith, New York.*
1924 *L. Pichard, Paris.*
1926•1931•1950•1967•1968 *edd. M. Ponchont, Paris.*
1927•1937•1959 *edd. F. W. Lenz (Levy), Lipsiae et Lugduni Batavorum.*
1928 *F. Calonghi, Torino.*
1951•1968 *edd. O. Tescari, Milano.*
1958•1959•1968 *edd. R. Helm, Berlin.*
1960 *W. Willige, München.*
1964 *ed. altera F. W. Lenz, Lugduni Batavorum.*
G. Luck, Zürich-Stuttgart.
1965 *J. André, Paris.*
1971 *ed. tertia F. W. Lenz et G. C. Galinsky, Lugduni Batavorum.*
1973 *M. C. J. Putnam, Norman (Oklahoma).*
G. Namia, Torino.
1976 *T. Herrera Zapién, U.N.A.M. México.*
1980 *F. Della Corte, s. l., L. Valla.*
P. Murgatroyd, Pietermaritzburg.
1983 *E. Otón Sobrino, Barcelona.*
1990 *H. Fco Bauzá, Madrid.*
H. Tränkle (book III), Berlin-New York.

As regards the Lygdamus cycle, the only separate editions of the text of which I know are:

- H. DE LA VILLE DE MIRMONT, *Le poète Lygdamus, étude critique suivie d'une édition et d'une traduction des élegies*, Louvain, Peeters; Paris, Fontemoing 1904.

- G. NÉMETHY, *Lygdami carmina (accedit Panegyricus in Messallam)*, Budapestini 1906 (text with no critical apparatus, but accompanied by commentary in Latin).

- L. HERRMANN, "Le Pseudo-Lygdamus", *Latomus* 23 (1964) 726–749.

- H. TRÄNKLE, *Appendix Tibulliana*, Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter 1990. This is in fact a text revised of the *magna editio* de Lenz-Galinsky (1971), not an edition, with commentary of the whole of Book III of the *Corpus Tibullianum* (see my article-review in *Tempus* 6 [1994] 64–81).

CRITICAL EDITION

EDITIONES ET COMMENTATIONES IN APPARATV CRITICO LAVDATAE

Aldina 1502	Editio Aldina, Venetiis: A. Manutius, 1502 (= *Aldina I*).
Aldina 1515	Editio Aldina, Venetiis: A. Manutius, 1515 (= *Aldina II*).
Bach	E. C. Chr. Bach, Berolini 1819.
Baehrens	E. Baehrens, *Albii Tibulli elegiarum carmina libri II. Accedunt Pseudotibulliana*, Leipzig, 1878.
Bartoliniana 1472	Editio Bartoliniana, s. l., c. a. 1472.
Becker	G. A. Becker, *Elegeia Romana*, Servestae, 1827.
Belling 1893	H. Belling, *Kritische Prolegomena zu Tibull*, Berlin 1893.
Belling 1897	H. Belling, *Albius Tibullus. Untersuchung und Text* (I: *Untersuchung der Elegien des A. Tibullus mit Beiträgen zu Properz, Horaz, Lygdamus, Ovid*; II: *Die Dichtungen des A. Tibullus in cronologischer Anordnung*, Berlin 1897.
Bergk	Bergkii coniecturae inveniuntur in editione A. Rossbach, *Tibulli libri quattuor*, Lipsiae 1859.
Bolle	L. Bolle, *De Lygdami carminibus*, Neustettin 1875.
Brixiensis 1486	Editio Brixiensis, *Catullus cum commentariis Parthenii, Tibullus cum commentariis, Propertius cum brevibus elucubrationibus*, Brixiae: apud Boninum de Boninis de Ragusia, 1486.
Broukhusius	J. Van Broekhuyzen, *Albii Tibulli equitis Rom. quae exstant, ad fidem veterum membranarum sedulo castigata. Accedunt Notae, cum Variar. Lectionum Libello, et terni Indices; quorum primus Omnes Voces Tibullianas complectitur*, Amstelaedami: officina Wetsteniana, 1708.
Burmann	P. Burmann, vid. *Voss.*

Calonghi F. CALONGHI, *Albii Tibulli aliorumque carminum libri IV*, Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum 48, Torino 1928.

Cartault A. CARTAULT, *Tibulle et les auteurs du Corpus Tibullianum*, Paris: Armand Colin 1909.

Cyllenius BERNARDINVS CYLLENIVS VERONENSIS, *Tibullus cum commentariis*, Hieronimus Avantius (ed.), Venetiis: Ioannes Iacuinus, 1500.

Damsté P. H. DAMSTÉ, "Ad Lygdami elegias", *Mnemosyne* 36 (1908) 205–210.

De Golbéry PH. A. DE GOLBÉRY, *Albii Tibulli quae supersunt opera omnia varietate lectionum, novis commentariis, excursibus, imitationibus Gallicis, vita auctoris et indice absolutissimo*, Parisiis 1826.

Dissen L. DISSEN, *Albii Tibulli Carmina ex recensione Car. Lachmanni passim mutata*, Gottingae: Libraria Dieterichiana 1835.

Dousa I. DOVSA FILIVS, *Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, denuo recogniti ac variis lectionibus et notis illustrati a Iano Dousa filio. Accessere Pervigilium Veneris et carmina graeca, quae aut e latino Catulli expressa sunt, aut a Catullo ipso latine translata. Item Ios. Scaligeri et Henr. Stephani e Tibullo et Propertio versiones graecae. Iani Dousae filii in Cat. Tib. Propert. coniectanea et notae*, Lugduni Batavorum: ex officina Plantiniana Fr. Raphelengius, 1592.

Gebhardus IANI GEBHARDVS, *In Catullum, Tibullum et Propertium animadversiones cum I. Meleagri in Val. Catullum Spicilegio*, Hanov. 1618. Cf. *Livineius*.

Guyetus GVYETI coniecturae inveniuntur in *Notis in Tibullum* HEINSII. Vid. *Heinsius*.

Havet L. HAVET, *Manuel de critique verbale apliquée aux textes latins*, Paris: Hachette, 1911 (cf. PONCHONT, pp. XXXVII–XL).

Heinsius N. HEINSIVS, *Notae in Tibullum*, quod libellum in editione Broukhusii inveniuntur, pp. 442–458.

N. Heinsivs, *Ex adversariis*, quod libellum in editione Broukhusii continetur, pp. 459–466.

Herrmann L. Herrmann, "Le Pseudo-Lygdamus", *Latomus* 23 (1964) 726–749.

Heyne-Wunderlich Chr. Gottl. Heyne, *Albius Tibullus. Carmina libri tres cum libro quarto Sulpiciae et aliorum* (*cum notis* E. C. F. Wunderlich *et supplemento* L. Dissen), Lipsiae 1819 (denuo Hildesheim: Georg Olms 1975).

Hiller E. Hiller, *Albii Tibulli elegiae cum carminibus pseudotibullianis*, Lipsiae 1885 (denuo Hildesheim: Georg Olms 1965).

Huschke J. G. Huschke, *Tibulli carmina*, Lipsiae 1819.

Kraffert H. Kraffert, *Beitträge zur Kritik und Erklarung lateinischer Autoren*, Aurich 1883.

Lachmann C. Lachmann, *Tibulli libri quattuor*, Berolini, 1829.

Lee G. Lee, *Tibullus: Elegies*, Leeds: Francis Cairns, 1990[3].

Lenz-Galinsky F. W. Lenz et G. K. Galinsky, *Albii Tibulli aliorumque carminum libri tres*, Lugduni Batavorum: E. J. Brill, 1971[3] (corr. edd. 1959, 1964).

Levy F. W. Levy (= Lenz), *Albii Tibulli aliorumque carminum libri tres*, Lipsiae 1927.

Lipsiensis 1500 Editio Lipsiensis, *Albii Tibulli, Elegiographorum optimi, elegia de amore et laudibus Messallae*, Lipsiae: ex officina Iacobi Thanner, 1500.

Lipsius Varias lectiones ex codicibus Romanis a Justo Lipsio collectas, et manu Jani Dousae patris descriptas ad marginem editionis Plantinianae a. 1569, quae inveniuntur in editione Broukhusii (in commentationibus ad loc. et in Variarum Lectionum Libello, pp. 409–441).

Livineius I. Livineivs, *Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, cum I. Livineii notis antehac ineditis, nec non uberioribus Iani*

Gebhardi animadversionibus cum I. Meleagri Spicilegio, Francofurti 1621.

Luck — G. Luck, *Albii Tibulli aliorumque carmina*, Stutgardiae: Teubner, 1988.

Müller — L. Müller, *Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii carmina. Accedunt Laevii Calvi Cinnae aliorum reliquiae et Priapea*, Lipsiae: Teubner 1874.

Muretus — M. A. Mvretvs, *Catullus et in eum Commentarius M. Ant. Mureti. Ab eodem correcti et scholiis illustrati Tibullus et Propertius*, Lugduni: G. Rovillius, 1559.

Némethy — G. Némethy, *Lygdami Carmina. Accedit Panegyricus in Messallam*, Budapestini 1905–1906.

Passeratius — Io. Passerativs, *Commentarii in Catullum, Tibullum et Propertium*, Parisiis: Cl. Morellum 1608.

Petreius — A. Petrevs (vel Perreivs), variae lectiones ex codicibus Romanis et Florentinis scriptae ad oras editionis Aldinae a. 1515, quae inveniuntur in editione Broukhusii (in commentationibus ad loc. et in Variarum Lectionum Libello, pp. 409–441).

Pichard — L. Pichard, *Tibulle et les auteurs du Corpus Tibullianum*, Paris: Librairie ancienne Honoré Champion 1924.

Pinelliana 1472 — Editio Pinelliana, Venetiis: Florentius Argentarius sive de Strassburg, 1472.

Plantiniana 1569 — Editio Plantiniana, Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, cum notis Theod. Pulmann, Antwerpiae: ex officina Chph. Plant., 1569.

Ponchont — M. Ponchont, *Tibulle et les auteurs du Corpus Tibullianum*, Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles-Lettres", 1968 (1926^{1}).

Pontanus — Io. Iov. Pontanvs (a. 1426–1503), coniecturae et notae quae inveniuntur in editione Broukhusii (in commentationibus et in Variarum Lectionum Libello, pp. 409–441).

Postgate	J. P. POSTGATE, *Tibulli Aliorumque Carmina Libri Tres*, Oxonii 1905 (corr. 1915²).
Princeps mai. 1472	EDITIO PRINCEPS MAIOR, Venetiis: Wendelinus de Spira, 1472.
Princeps min. 1472	EDITIO PRINCEPS MINOR, Venetiis: Federicus de Comitibus, 1472.
Puccius	F. PVCCIVS (a. 1462–1512), nonnullae notae a nescio quo in exemplar editionis Vicentinae a. 1481 translatae, quae in app. crit. Lachmanniano inveniuntur.
Pulmann	THEOD. PULMANN, vid. *Plantiniana 1569*.
Regiensis 1481	EDITIO REGIENSIS, *Tibulli, Catulli, Propertii, cum eorum vita opera*, per Prosperum Odoardum et Albertum de Mazalibus, Regii Lepidi 1481.
Romana 1475	EDITIO ROMANA, cum commentario BERNARDINI CYLLENII VERONENSIS, Romae 1475.
Scaliger	J. SCALIGER, *Catullus, Propertius ex recensione Scaligeri. Accedit eiusdem castigationum liber*, Lutetiae Parisiorum, 1577 (1582, 1600, 1607).
Schrader	H. SCHRADERI coniecturae quae inveniuntur in editione VOSSII.
Schuster	M. SCHUSTER, *Tibull-Studien. Beiträge zue Erklärung und Kritik Tibulls un des Corpus Tibullianum*, Wien 1930 (denuo Hildesheim: Georg Olms 1968).
Smith	K. F. SMITH, *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus. The corpus Tibullianum edited with Introduction and Notes on Books I, II, and IV.2–14*, New York: American Book Company, 1913 (denuo Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1985). Est textum editionis Hiller (1885), sed aliquando mutatum (vid. Appendix, pp. 527–528).
Statius	ACHILLES STATIVS, *Tibullus cum commentario*, Venetiis: A. Manutius 1567 (= *editio Aldina III*).

Tescari O. TESCARI, *Tibullo e gli altri poeti del 'Corpus Tibullianum'*, Classici greci e latine XI, Milano: Istituto Editoriale Italiano 1951.

Tränkle H. TRÄNKLE, *Appendix Tibulliana*, Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1990.

Tuscanella H. TVSCANELLA, *Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii et Cornelii Galli opera cum indice Horatii Tuscanellae*, Basileae: Henrico Petrus 1569.

Vicentina 1481 EDITIO VICENTINA, *Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii carmina et Statii Silvae*, curata a Ioanne Calphurnio, Vicentiae: apud Ioannem Renensem et Dionysium Bertocchum, 1481.

Voss J. H. VOSS, *Tibull und Lygdamus nach den Handschriften berichtiget, mit Anmerk.* P. BURMANNS *und den Konjeturen* SCHRADERS, Heidelberg 1811.

Vulpius I. A. VVLPIVS, *Albius Tibullus, eques Romanus, et in eum Io. Antonii Vulpii philologi ac rhetoris in gymnasio pataviano novus commentarius diligentissimus*, Patavii 1749.

Wunderlich E. C. F. WUNDERLICH, vid. *Heyne-Wunderlich.*

CONSPECTVS SIGLORVM

I) Codices

A = Ambrosianus R. 26 sup., s. XIV
B = Berolinensis Lat. Quart. 309, a. 1451
C = Caesaraugustanus, Bibl. del Real Seminario de San Carlos A-5-9 (9377), a. 1469 scr. a Iacobutio
D = Bodmerianus 163, s. XV ex. (¿c. a. 1480–1490?)
E_1 = Escorialensis, Real Bibl. de S. Lorenzo de El Escorial ç.IV.22 (a), s. XV med.
E_2 = Escorialensis, Real Bibl. de S. Lorenzo de El Escorial s.III.22, c. a. 1450–1475
F = lectiones fragmenti Cuiaciani aetatis incertae, nunc deperditi, ex collatione Iosephi Scaligeri in ed. Plant. a. 1569
G = Guelferbytanus Aug. 82,6, s. XV scr. a Pontano, ut vid.
H = Hamburguensis, Bibl. Publ. et Univ. scrin 139.4, s. XV
I = Genovensis Berianus Cf. Arm. 6, s. XV
M = Monacensis, Universitätsbibl. Clm 14486, s. XV
Ox_1 = Oxoniensis, Bibl. Bodl. lat. class. d.5 (30059), a. 1420 vel 1421, ut vid.
Ox_2 = Oxoniensis, Bibl. Bodl. lat. class. D'Orville 167. Auct. X. 1.5.20 (17045), s. XVI
O = Vaticanus Ottobon. lat. 1202, a Lysandro Aurispa a. 1426 scr.
P = Vaticanus Pal. lat. 910, a. 1467
T = Paris. Bibl. Nat. lat. 7989, a. 1423. Est codex Traguriensis.
V = Vaticanus Lat. 3270, s. XIV vel XV
V_2 = Vaticanus Lat. 2794, a. 1434
X_1 = Bruxellensis, Bibl. Royale Albert Ier 14638, c. a. 1450–1460
X_2 = Bruxellensis, Bibl. Royale Albert Ier 14640, s. XV
ω = consensus plerique codicum

II) Excerpta et florilegia

f = Excerpta Frisingensia, Monacensis, Universitätsbibl. Clm. 6292, ff. 117^r–118^r, s. X exeuntis vel s. XI ineuntis

g =		Florilegium Gallicum c. a. 1150, quod in aliquot codicibus s. XII–XIV exstat
v =		Florilegium codicis Marciani Lat. Z 497 (1811), s. XI exeuntis, a Laurentino Amalfitano in monasterio Casiniensi comparatum
Vincent. Bellov. =		Vincentii Bellovacensis excerpta, s. XIII vel ante

III) Nonnulli codices quorum aliquando mentio fit in apparatu critico, sed ego non praesens contuli

Askewianus: Askewianus Berol. Diez. B. Sant. 21, s. XV, cont. Lachmann

Bergomas: Bergomas, Bibl. Civ. Angelo Mai Δ. V. 10 s. XV

Bernensis: Bernensis 527, s. XV parte post, cont. Luck

Brixianus: Brixianus Quirinal A. VII. 7 s. XV, ff. 116–151^{v}, cont. Calonghi

Cuiacianus: Cuiacianus recentior Scaligeri, nunc Londin. Bibl. Brit. Egerton 3027, a. 1476

Datanus: Datanus Berol. Diez. B. Sant. 39 b, chartac., s. XV, cont. Lachmann

Eboracensis: codex Archiepiscopi Eboracensis nunc deperditus scr. a. 1425, cont. N. Heinsius in Berol. Diez. B. Sant. 55 d pp. 15–24, cuius collationem publici iuris fecit H. Belling Quaest. Tibull. (Progr. Berol. 1894) 21–25; denuo inspexit Lenz.

Lachmanniani: consensus codicum Wittiani, Datani, Askewiani, quos Lachmann appellavit *C*

Thuaneus: Parisinus lat. 8459, a. 1481 vel aliquanto post. Thuaneum apellat Lenz

Vindobonensis: Vindobonensis, Bibl. Austr. Nat. 2243, c. a. 1460–1470, cont. Luck

Wittianus: Wittianus membr. deperditus s. XV, cont. Broukhusius i. m. ed. Gryph. a. 1551

TEXT

ALBII TIBVLLI
LIBER TERTIVS
LYGDAMI ELEGIARVM LIBER

I

Martis Romani festae venere Kalendae
(exoriens nostris hinc fuit annus avis),
et vaga nunc certa discurrunt undique pompa
perque vias Vrbis munera perque domos.
«Dicite, Pierides, quonam donetur honore
seu mea, seu fallor, cara Neaera tamen».
«Carmine formosae, pretio capiuntur avarae».
«Gaudeat, ut digna est, versibus illa meis».
«Lutea sed niveum involvat membrana libellum,
pumex et canas tondeat arte comas

Excerpta: **I 7** *g* (pretio capiuntur avari)

I 2 hinc *C, Bernensis, Scaliger ex Cuiaciano, quem sequuntur Broukhusius, Heyne-Wunderlich, De Golbéry, Müller, Baehrens, Hiller, nuper Luck (cf. Ov. Fasti 3.75, 145)* : huic E_1 : hic *ω, edd. vett. et plerique recc.* **3** et *ω* : ut *D, ed. Romana 1475, Voss* * certa *codd.* : crebra *Luck ex Lachmann (ad Prop. 164)* **6** ne(a)era *ω* : nehera Ox_1V^2 : nerea *C* **7-14** *Musis poetae respondentibus dederunt plurimi edd. a Mureto; sed ego cum Ehwald (Philologus 60 [1901] 572-573), Schuster (Tibullen-Studien [1930] 151) et Lieberg (Prometheus 6 [1980] 141-142) totam elegiam sic intelligo: 1-6 Lygdamus, 7 Musae, 8 Lygdamus, 9-14 Musae, 15-28 Lygdamus* **7** formosae *codd.* : formoso *Baehrens, qui* pretio capiuntur avarae! *seclusit* * avar(a)e *ω* : avari *g* **8** meis *codd.* : tuis *Muretus, quem sequuntur Némethy, Tescari, Lenz-Galinsky, Luck et Lee (cf. Lygd. 4.57)* : novis *Postgate* : magis *McKay (Latomus 46 [1987] 213-214) post* **9** *lacunam 2 vers. temere indic. Cartault* **10** pumex et (ex *i. ras.*) G^2, *codd. Heinsii, Muretus, plerique edd.* : pumicet et *ω, Cartault, Smith, Lenz-Galinsky, def. Boscherini (A & R 4 [1959] 152-154)* : pumiceque et *C* : pumex cui *Huschke, quem sequuntur Dissen in app. crit. et in comm. 320, deinde Némethy et Luck* : pumex ei *Dziatzko 117, qui velut interpositionem hunc versum interp.* : pumex sed *Ehwald (Philologus 60 [1901] 575)* : pumice quae *Voss ex coni. Heinsii, tondeat pro tondeatur dictum esse statuens* * arte E_2 *(i. mg.)* Ox_2, *Brixianus, Wittianus, Guyetus coni., ed. Aldina 1515, Herrmann* : ante *ω, edd. fere omnes* : *om. C*

summaque praetexat tenuis fastigia charta
  indicet ut nomen littera facta tuum
atque inter geminas pingantur cornua frontes:
  sic etenim comptum mittere oportet opus».
«Per, vos, auctores huius mihi carminis, oro,
  Castaliamque umbram Pieriosque lacus,
ite domum cultumque illi donate libellum,
  sicut erit: nullus defluat inde color.
Illa referte mihi sit nostri mutua cura
  an minor an toto pectore deciderim.

---

11 pr(a)etexat $BE_1E_2GHOx_2V_2^2$, *Brixianus* : protexat MOx_1V^2 *(s. l.)* V_2X_1 : protexar X_2 : protextat *C* : protexit *ADIOPTV, Eboracensis* * tenuis *codd.* : titulus *Birt (Buchwesen 67)* : minium *Némethy (RhM 64 [1909] 472)* * charta *Becker, Cartault, Luck et Tränkle* : carta *Datanus, Baehrens, Pichard* : c(h)art(a)e *ω* (carthae I^2, h *s. l.*), edd. vett. et plerique recc.
16 *v*

12 facta *ω*, *def. Damsté 205-206* : sancta *Guelferbyt. 4 Heynii* : vasta *Havet, sequente eius auctoritatem Pichard* : festa *dub. Müller* : picta *Livineius* : pacta *Tuscanella in ed. Basiliensis 1569, Dziatzko* : rubra *Némethy* * tuum ω : meum CV^2 *(i. mg. vix leg.), Guelferbyt. 3 Heynii, nonn. edd. a Broukhusio* : suum I^2 (s *s. l.*), *Herrmann (Latomus 8 [1949] 53)* : tui *Havet* : puer *Lachmann dubitanter in app. crit., Haupt et Vahlen ediderunt* **13-14** *ut spurios del. Herrmann* **13** inter *codd.* : intra *Blümner (Philologus 73 [1881] 434 ss.)* : infra *Luck* * geminas *ω* : gemmas E_1 : geminae *Wunderlich, quem nuper sequitur Possanza (CQ 44 [1994] 281-282)* * frontes *ω* : fronte *B* * *post* frontes *sic distinxi* **14** etenim ω : etiam *D, Guelferbyt. 1 et 4 Heynii, ed. Aldina 1502, Brixiensis 1486, Cyllenius* **15** per vos *ω* : parvos AOx_2TV (per vos *s. l. et i. ras.* V^2) X_2 **16** umbram *vω* : undam *s. l.* G^2 (umbram *G*), *Luck* : umbrosam *ATV* (umbram *corr.* V^2) * pieriosque *ω* : pieridosque *Brixianus* **17** libellum *ω* : puellae *P* **18** erit *ω*, *plerique edd. vett et omnes recc.* : erat *P* (a *in* i *corr.* P^2), *edd. Aldinae 1502 et 1515, Statius, Voss, Bach* * inde *ω* : ante *P* * color *codd.* : dolor *Herrmann* **19** illa *ω* : ille I^2 (e *s. l.*), *Helm (PhW 47 [1927] 1391 et ed.)* * referte mihi *Skutsch (Philologus 110 [1966] 144 n. 1, 113 [1969] 156), cf. Ov. Tr. 4.3.9* : mihi referat CDE_2MX_2, *Guelferbyt. 1 et 4 Heynii, Muretus, Statius, Tränkle (cf. Lygd. 2.18)* : mihi referet *ω*, *plerique edd. a Scaligero* : mihi refert BE_1P * sit nostri mutua cura *Lee (PCPhS 5 [1958/59] 21)* : si nostri mutua cura *Brixianus* : nostri sit mutua cura *Voss* : nostri si mutua cura *C* : si nostri (nostri si Ox_1, *Lachmanniani*) mutua (mutuo Ox_2) cura est *ω* **20** an minor *ω*, *edd.* : an miror X_2 : an maneam *G, Brixianus, Pontanus, Baehrens* : anne amer *Heinsius (Ex adversariis c. 1)* : aut minor *Ayrmann (Vita Tibulli § 86)* * an toto *ω* : toto an *M* : toto ante X_2 : intoto *B* : et toto *susp. Statius qui viderat 'e toto' in Vaticano* * deciderim *codd.* : exciderim *suspici (cf. Verg. Aen. 1.26; Ov. Her. 20.190; com. ad loc.)*

Sed primum meritam larga donate salute
atque haec submisso dicite verba sono:
“Haec tibi vir quondam, nunc frater, casta Neaera,
mittit et accipias munera parva rogat,
teque suis iurat caram magis esse medullis,
sive sibi coniunx, sive futura soror,
sed potius coniunx: huius spem nominis illi
auferet extincto pallida Ditis aqua”».

21 meritam DE_2GV^2, *Cyllenius in ed. Romana 1475, def. Broukhusius in comm. Scaligerum sequens, Heyne, Dissen, Lachmann, edd. recc.* : meritum ABG^2 (tum *s. l.*) $HOx_1Ox_2TVV_2X_1$: nuncium *I* : nuntium *OP, ed. Pinelliana 1472* : nympham E_1MX_2, *Bergomas, Brixianus, plerique edd. vett., Muretus, Statius, Scaliger, Vulpius, Wunderlich, Huschke, De Golbéry* : nimphen *C* : myrtum *exc. Lipsii, Askewianus*^{2} *(i. mg.), def. Wijdeveld (Mnemosyne 11 [1942-43] 79-80)* * larga *ω, plerique edd. vett. et omnes recc. a Baehrens* : longa *Lachmanniani, Broukhusius ex Scaligero, nonn. edd. usque ad Lachmann et Dissen* **23** haec . . . nunc *ω* : nec . . . nec MX_2 * neera *ω* : nehera Ox_1V_2 : neer *O* : nerea *C* **24** et *ω* : ut *D, ed. Brixiensis 1486* **25** c(h)aram *ω* : carum *G* **26** sive sibi *ω* : sive tibi $AIOx_1V$ (sibi *i. mg.* V^2) : sive’s tu *Havet, quem sequuntur Pichard et Tescari* **28** auferet *ω* : auferat *C* : aufert et *P*

II

Qui primus caram iuveni carumque puellae
  eripuit iuvenem, ferreus ille fuit.
Durus et ille fuit, qui tantum ferre dolorem,
  vivere et erepta coniuge qui potuit.
Non ego firmus in hoc, non haec patientia nostro
  ingenio: frangit fortia corda dolor.
nec mihi vera loqui pudor est vitaeque fateri
  tot mala perpessae taedia nata meae.
Ergo cum tenuem fuero mutatus in umbram
  candidaque ossa super nigra favilla teget,
ante meum veniat longos incompta capillos
  et fleat ante meum maesta Neaera rogum.
Sed veniat carae matris comitata dolore:
  maereat haec genero, maereat illa viro.

II 1-2 *f* **6** *g, Vincent. Bellov.* (frangit fortia corda dolor)

1 primus ω : primum E_1, *ed. Aldina 1502* * carumque ω : carumve $CE_2H^2Ox_1V_2$, *Voss, Bach* : caramve *H* : caraeque *edd. pr. mai. 1472, Vicentina et Regiensis 1481* **3** durus et ω : ferreus *exc. Perrei et Pocchi, ed. Aldina 1502* : durior *Hoeufft (Peric. 222), Huschke* **5** firmus ω : fortis *exc. Pocchi* * non haec (*i. mg. add.* O^2) patientia (tia *s. l. add.* O^2) nostro (nostra *I*) ω : non haec patiemur ex aequo *Petreius 'ex antiquis', ed. pr. mai. 1472* : non hoc nostro patiemur (patiamur, a *s. l.* P^2) MPX_2 : non hoc patiemur et aequo E_1, *ed. Pinelliana 1472* : non pacientientia nostro *C* **7** nec . . . vera ω, *ed. Aldina 1515* : nec . . . verba OPX_2 : haec. . . . vera *ed. pr. min. 1502* : haec . . . verba E_1, *Brixianus, edd. pr. mai. 1472 et Aldina 1502* : haec . . . nunc *C* * est ω : *om.* ACV^1 (est *s. l. add.* V^2) **8** t(a)edia nata ω, *edd.* : t(a)edia nota GV^2 (nota *i. mg.*), *Brixianus, Scaliger ex cod., Luck* : tot superesse *edd. Aldinae 1502 et 1515, Statius ex cod. suo* : tot superasse *C* **9** ergo cum ω, *ed. pr. min. 1472, Statius in comm., sequente eius auctoritatem Broukhusio et edd. recc.* : ergo ego cum $DE_1E_2Ox_1^2$ (ego *s. l.*) V^2 (ego *i. mg.*), *edd. pr. mai. 1472, Aldinae 1502 et 1515, Luck* **10** super I^2 (per *s. l.*) CDE_2GT, *edd. pr. min. 1472, Aldinae 1502 et 1515, plerique edd. vett. et recc.* : supera *O* (e *del. et i. mg. add.* supra O^2) : supra ω, *edd. pr. mai. et Pinelliana 1472, Regiensis 1481, Lipsiensis 1500, Cartault, Postgate* 1915^2, *Pichard, Ponchont, Tescari, Lee* * nigra ω : magna *O, Brixianus* **11** meum ω : urbem *tempt. Tränkle haud recte* * veniat longos ω : longos veniat *Askewianus, Datanus* **12** *om.* X_2 * m(a)esta ω : casta *C, ed. pr. min. 1472* * ne(a)era ω : nehera Ox_1V_2 : nerea *C*

Praefatae ante meos manes animamque precatae
perfusaeque pias ante liquore manus,
pars quae sola mei superabit corporis, ossa
incinctae nigra candida veste legant,
et primum annoso spargant collecta Lyaeo,
mox etiam niveo fundere lacte parent,
post haec carbaseis umorem tollere ventis
atque in marmorea ponere sicca domo.
Illic quas mittit dives Panchaia merces
Eoique Arabes, dives et Assyria,
et nostri memores lacrimae fundantur eodem:
sic ego componi versus in ossa velim.
Sed tristem mortis demonstret littera causam
atque haec in celebri carmina fronte notet:
LYGDAMVS HIC SITVS EST: DOLOR HVIC ET CVRA NEAERAE,
CONIVGIS EREPTAE, CAVSA PERIRE FVIT.

---

15 pr(a)efat(a)e ante ω : praefataeque *Huschke* * meos ω : mei *Havet, quod Pichard recepit* * animamque ω : aramque *C* * precatae *Eboracensis, Cyllenius, Muretus, ed. Plantiniana 1569, Heinsius (ad Ov. Fasti 6.303), Broukhusius ex codd., Vulpius, Heyne-Wunderlich, plerique edd. recc.* : rogat(a)e ω, *edd. pr. mai et min. 1472, Pinelliana 1472, Aldinae 1502 et 1515, Statius* : togatae *G (s. l.* rogatae G^2*) H (ut vidi), susp. Statius in comm. ('habitus meretricius')* : rigatae *Scaliger* : rogantes E_2 : recentem *Bach, quem sequuntur Postgate, Tränkle et Lee (cf. Ov. Met. 8.488)* : rogatam *vel* vocatam *Cartault* : vocatu *Havet, quod Pichard recepit* : rogando *mal. Voss*
17 qu(a)e ω, *edd. Aldinae 1502 et 1515* : quoque CE_2HMPV^2 *(i. mg.)* X_2 (quae *i. mg.* X_2^2*, sed in v. 18 ante* incinctae*), Askewianus, Datanus, edd. pr. mai et min. 1472, Romana 1475* : quaeque *ed. Pinelliana 1472* **18-19** legant . . . spargant I^2 (a *s. l.), Muretus, Broukhusius, Vulpius, Heyne-Wunderlich, De Golbéry, Némethy, Tescari (Convivium 1938, 235 et ed.), Tränkle* : legent (legant *H*) . . . spargent ω, *plerique edd.* : legent . . . spargant *Luck* * collecta ω : perfusa E_1MX_2, *ed. pr. min. 1472* **21** ventis ω, *Brixianus, Statius, Lachmann* : velis I^2 *(i. mg.)* E_2^2 *(i. mg.), tres Vossiani ap. Huschke, nonn. edd. vett. ex Mureto, plerique edd. recc.* : vittis *unus Colbertinus ap. Heyne-Wunderlich, nonn. codd. ap. Statium* : linis *vel* villis *Voss* **23** illic ω, *edd. vett., Lachmann, Dissen, Hiller, Müller, Postgate, Ponchont, Lenz-Galinsky, Lee* : illinc *C* : illuc *Passeratius ex coni., quem sequuntur Guyetus, Broukhusius, Vulpius, Heyne-Wunderlich, De Golbéry, Baehrens, Némethy, Cartault, Luck et Tränkle* * dives ω, *def. Vahlen (Opuscula I 359)* : pinguis *Brixianus, Wittianus, coni. Broukhusius*
24 eoique ω : eoi atque *M* * dives ω, *edd.* : pinguis CV_2^2 *(i. mg.), Bergomas, duo Statiani, nonn. codd. ap. Heyne-Wunderlich, Muretus edidit* **26** versus ω : carmen *duo Statiani*
27 sed ω : sic *ed. Aldina 1515, Statius, Tuscanella in ed. Basiliensis 1569* * demonstret ω : designet *C* * causam ω : casum *G, Florentinus Statii, ed. Brixiensis 1486, Cyllenius*
29 lygdamus DE_1E_2GM : ligdamus ω : lygdarnus X_2 * cura G^2 *(s. l.) P, Puccius* : cara GV^2 *(i. mg.)* : causa ω * neaerae *Muretus* : ne(a)era ω : nehera Ox_1V_2 : nerea COx_2

III

Quid prodest caelum votis implesse, Neaera,
  blandaque cum multa tura dedisse prece,
non ut marmorei prodirem e limine tecti,
  insignis clara conspicuusque domo,
aut ut multa mei renovarent iugera tauri
  et magnas messes terra benigna daret,
sed tecum ut longae sociarem gaudia vitae
  inque tuo caderet nostra senecta sinu,
tunc cum permenso defunctus tempore lucis
  nudus Lethaea cogerer ire rate?

III 1 implesse ω : complesse *P* * votis ω : flammis *$CE_2V_2^2$ (i. mg.), edd. pr. mai. et min. 1472, Vicentina 1481* * ne(a)era ω : nehera *Ox_1V_2* : nerea *C* : neeram *E_1* **2** blandaque cum multa ω *(cum s. l. add. V_2^2)* : multaque cum blanda *Bergk, Müller* * dedisse ω : tulisse *T, Statius* **3** marmorei ω : marmoreo *CP^2* (o *s. l.)* * tecti *codd.* : templi *Dousa (Praecid. c. 11), sed recte reiecit Broukhusius* **4** insignis clara *codd.* : clarus iam insignis *Herrmann* **5** renovarent ω : renovantur *H* **7** ut ω : et *Brixianus* * sociarem *E_2GHI^2* (rem *s. l.) V_2, edd. ab ed. pr. mai. 1472* : sociarent ω, *ed. pr. min. 1472* : sociarent et *Brixianus* : satiarem *BD, Scaliger ex edd. Brixiana 1486 et Veneta 1493* * gaudia ω : tempora *DE_2* **9** tunc cum *codd.* : tum cum *nonn. edd.* * permenso ω : praemenso *E_1, ed. Pinelliana 1472* : permensae *DE_2MX_2, Askewianus (ex corr.), Vaticanus Statii, ed. pr. mai. 1472, Cyllenius, Huschke* : praemensae *edd. pr. min. 1472, Aldinae 1502 et 1515, Broukhusius* : permisso *Damsté 206, denuo Herrmann* * tempore ω : tempora *DE_2MOPX_2, edd. Aldinae 1502 et 1515* **10** cogerer ω : cogeret *X_2, ed. Lipsiensis 1500*

Nam grave quid prodest pondus mihi divitis auri,
  arvaque si findant pinguia mille boves?
Quidve domus prodest Phrygiis innixa columnis,
  Taenare sive tuis, sive Caryste tuis,
et nemora in domibus sacros imitantia lucos
  aurataeque trabes marmoreumque solum?
Quidve in Erythraeo legitur quae litore concha
  tinctaque Sidonio murice lana iuvat,
et quae praeterea populus miratur? In illis
  invidia est: falso plurima vulgus amat.
Non opibus mentes hominum curaeque levantur:
  nam Fortuna sua tempora lege regit.
Sit mihi paupertas tecum iucunda, Neaera:
  at sine te regum munera nulla volo.

11-13 *g, Vincent. Bellov.* **16** *g, Vincent. Bellov.* **17-20** *g* **21-22** *fg* **24** *v*

11 nam grave quid prodest pondus mihi d. a. *ω* : quid prodesse potest pondus grave d. a. *g, Vincent. Bellov. (Speculum 5.73; 6.2), edidit Herrmann* **12** arvaque *ω* : prataque *Vincent. Bellov. (Speculum 5.73)* * findant *ω* : fundant *Vincent. Bellov. l. c.,* IOx_2 (i *s. l. corr.* I^2*), Askewianus, ed. Basiliensis 1569* : scindant *P* **13** innixa *ω* : annixa Ox_2 : subnixa *C, unus Colbertinus ap. Heyne-Wunderlich, ed. pr. min. 1472* : in mixta X_2 **17** quidve *ω* : quidque V_2 * legitur qu(a)e *gω* : legiturque *AB (lin. separav.* B^2*)* DOx_1 *(lin. separav.* Ox_{12}*)* *V* (quae *i. mg.* V^2) * litore : inlittore *AITV* **19-20** *om. H* **19** pr(a)eterea *ω* : preterita *P* **20** invidia est gG^2 (invida quae *G), Pontanus teste Puccio* : invidia qu(a)e E_1P*, ed. Pinelliana 1472* : invidia E_2 : invida qu(a)e *ω* (q *i. ras. A), edd. pr. min. et mai. 1472, Aldinae 1502 et 1515* : invidaque *C* **21** mentes *codd.* : luctus *Havet, quod Pichard recepit* * hominum $fgBCDE_2GHOx_1Ox_2TV^2$ *(i. mg.)* V_2X_1*, Askewianus, Brixianus, Datanus, ed. pr. mai. 1472* : homini AE_1G^2 *(s. l.) IMOPV* X_2*, ed. pr. min. 1472* **22** nam *gω* : nec *f, Ponchont* : non *Havet, quod Pichard recepit* * tempora *ω* : corpora *Herrmann* * regit *gG, Muretus, Scaliger, Heyne-Wunderlich, edd. recc.* : gerit *fω, edd. pr. mai et min. 1472, Aldinae 1502 et 1515, Statius, Broukhusius et Vulpius* **23** sit *ω* : sed *Eboracensis* : sic *Havet, quod Pichard recepit* * ne(a)era *ω* : nehera V_2 : nerea *C* **24** at $vCE_1GIOx_1OOx_2PTV^2V_2$*, Brixianus* : et $ABDE_2HMVX_1X_2$*, Eboracensis* : si *Heinsius* * sine te *ω* : te sine *O* * regum *ω* : regnum *I (corr.* I^2*), ed. pr. mai. 1472* * volo *ω* : velim MX_2

O niveam quae te poterit mihi reddere lucem!
 O mihi felicem terque quaterque diem!
At si, pro dulci reditu quaecumque voventur,
 audiat aversa non meus aure deus,
nec me regna iuvant nec Lydius aurifer amnis
 nec quas terrarum sustinet orbis opes.
Haec alii cupiant, liceat mihi paupere cultu
 securo cara coniuge posse frui.
Adsis et timidis faveas, Saturnia, votis,
 et faveas concha, Cypria, vecta tua.
Aut si fata negant reditum tristesque sorores,
 stamina quae ducunt quaeque futura canunt,
me vocet in vastos amnes nigramque paludem
 Ditis et ignavam luridus Orcus aquam.

---

26 *v* **29** *f* (lidius aurifer amnis) *gv, Vincent. Bellov.* **30-32** *g, Vincent. Bellov.* **38** *f* (luridus Orcus)

25 quae te poterit mihi *ω* : poterit quae te mihi *C* : mihi te poterit quae *Voss* * poterit *ω* : potuit *H* **28** aversa $BDHMOOx_2V^2X_2$, *Brixianus, Wittianus, edd. Aldinae 1502 et 1515, Plantiniana 1569* : eversa *C* : adversa $AE_1E_2GIOx_1PTVV_2X_1$, *Askewianus, Datanus, Eboracensis (cf. edd. ad Prop. 4.1.73; Ov. Her. 7.4), edd. pr. mai. et min. 1472* **29** nec *vω* : non *g, Vincent. Bellov. (Speculum 5.73; 81), GH* * me *ω* : mea COx_2 * iuvant *ω, Vincent. Bellov. l. c., edd. pr. min. et mai. 1472, Aldina 1502, Scaliger quem sequuntur Broukhusius et plerique edd.* : iuvent *GT, Askewianus, Datanus, Puccius, ed. Aldina 1515, Muretus, Statius, Passeratius, ed. Cantabrigensis 1702, Heyne-Wunderlich, De Golbéry* * nec *ω* : non *Vincent. Bellov. l. c.* * aurifer *ω* : aurifex *P* : artifex *Flor. Ambr. P. 140 sup.* **31** h(a)ec *ω* : nec MV_2 : hoc *Vincent. Bellov. (Speculum 5.81)* * cupiant *ω* : cupiunt *g in Paris. Bibl. Nat. lat. 17903 (olim Nostradamensis 108), s. XIII, Vincent. Bellov. l. c.* : capiant *C* **32** cara coniuge *codd.* : vitae munere *g, Vincent. Bellov. l. c.* * c(h)ara *ω* : cura *O* : curva E_1P **33** adsis et *ω* : adsit et *C* : assisque *O* : assis quae O^2 * faveas *ω* : faveat *C* **35** aut *ω* : at G^2P * fata *ω* : facta *H (corr.* H^2*)* *I (corr.* I^2*)* * reditum *ω* : redditum Ox_1V_2 *(corr.* V_2^2*)* : reditus DE_2 * tristesque *codd.* : Stygiaeque *vel* trinaeque *Heinsius dub. (Ex adversariis c. 1)* : triplicesque *S. Allen coll. Ov. Met. 8.452 ss.* **36** canunt *Heinsius (ad Ov. Her. 17.194 et in Ex adversariis c. 1), quod receperunt Broukhusius, Vulpius, Heyne-Wunderlich, De Golbéry, Postgate* 1915^2 *et Tränkle* : neunt *ω, edd. vett. et plerique recc.* : regunt *Dissen* **37** vocet *ω* : voce *C* * in *codd.* : ad *Voss* **38** ditis et *Vindobonensis, Heinsius (Ex adversariis c. 1), Baehrens* : ditis in *nonn. codd. Statii, 'vetus cod.' Heinsii, Némethy* : dives in *ω, plerique edd.* : Dives in *Schuster 153-154* : dives *C* : Dis et in *Luck* : Ditis ab *Müller* : livens *Courtney (Maia 29 [1987] 31)* : Lethes *Heinsius (l. c.)* * ignavam . . . aquam *Heinsius (l. c.)* : ignava . . . aqua *ω, def. Schuster 153-154* : ignavia . . . aqua *I (corr.* I^2*)* *O (corr.* O^2*)* : ignara . . . aqua *Askewianus* : ignavae . . . aquae *Heinsius (l. c.)* : ignaram . . . aquam *'vetus cod.' Heinsii, edidit Luck* * luridus *ω* : lucidus V_2

IV

Di meliora ferant, nec sint mihi somnia vera,
  quae tulit hesterna pessima nocte quies.
Ite procul, vani, falsumque avertite, visus:
  desinite in ventis quaerere velle fidem.
Divae vera monent, venturi nuntia, sortes;
  vera monent Tuscis exta probata viris.
Somnia fallaci ludunt temeraria nocte
  et pavidas mentes falsa timere iubent
et natum in curas hominum genus omina noctis
  farre pio placant et saliente sale.

7-8 *fg. Vincent. Bellov.*

1 mihi somnia *ω, ed. pr. mai. 1472* : insomnia DE_1MX_2, *Datanus, ed. pr. min. 1472, prob. Muretus, Heyne-Wunderlich, Müller, De Golbéry, Luck* : mea somnia E_2, *Guelferbyt. 3 Heynii, ed. Romana 1475, Cyllenius* **2** hesterna $ADE_1GHIMOTVX_1X_2$, *ed. pr. mai. 1472* : externa $BCE_2Ox_1Ox_2$ PV_2, *Datanus, Wittianus, ed. pr. min. 1472* : extrema *Scaliger ex Cuiaciano, Broukhusius, De Golbéry, Müller, def. Francken (Mnemosyne 13 [1885] 184)* * pessima *ω, ed. pr. mai. 1472* : proxima *CP, Guelferbyt. 3 Heynii, ed. pr. min. 1472 et Scaligeri edd.* **3-4** *post v. 16 reponebant Postgate et Herrmann non recte* **3** vani falsumque . . . visus *Lee (PCPhS 20 [1974] 57)* : vani falsique . . . visus *Bolle 15, quod recepit Pichard* : vani *(vel* vanum*)* falsumque . . . visum *codd., edd.* * vani *ω* : vanum $HOx_1Ox_2V^2$ *(i. mg.)* X_1, *Eboracensis, Lachmanniani* : vanum est *Luck* : vanis *Baehrens (i. e.* ad vanos*)* * avertite *ω* : advertite Ox_1 **4** desinite *ω* : desine et *G* (desinite *s. l.* G^2) * in ventis *Thörnell (Eranos 32 [1934] 146)* : in nobis *Guyetus, plerique edd.* : in votis *ω, vett. edd., Lachmann* : in somnis *cod. Ferrarii, ed. Aldina 1515 in Bibl. Nac. R. 34671 (i. mg.), Huschke, quod recepit De Golbéry* : in vanis *susp. Muretus in comm., def. Vahlen (Opuscula I 358) et Schuster 155-156, edidit Levy 1926* : inventis *vel* invitis *Statius* : in vobis *Scaliger sequentibus eius auctoritatem Broukhusio, Vulpio et Heyne, denuo coni. Hermann* : in veris *susp. Heinsius (Not. in Tib.)* : in notis *Baehrens* : et vobis *vel* a nobis *Bach* : in naris *Havet, quod recepit Pichard et Tescari* **5** divae vera monent venturi nuntia sortes *scripsi* : divi vera monent venturae nuntia sortis *codd.* **7** fallaci *ω* : quae falsa *C* **8** falsa *codd.* : vana *Voss* **9** et *ω* : at G^2 (a *s. l.), Muretus ex 'vetere libro', prob. Heyne-Wunderlich* * natum in curas $CDOx_2V_2^2$ *(i. ras.), Muretus 'ex vetere libro', ed. Vicentina 1481* : natum in curam *Brixianus, ed. pr. mai. 1472* : vanum in curas *exc. Lipsii et Petrei* : natum maturas *AOTV* : natum naturas *I* : vatum natura I^2 (s *expunx.)* : vanum ventura $E_1GOx_1V^2$ *(i. mg.)* V_2 *(ut leg.)* X_1, *Brixianus*^{2}, *ed. pr. min. 1472* : vanum eventura *Baehrens* : varium ventura *HP* : vanum metuens E_2G^2 (metuens *i. mg.)* X_2^2 (vanum *s. l.), edd. Romana 1475, Aldinae 1502 et 1515* : vanum mutuens *M* : tantum metuens X_2, *unus Statii* : vatum mentes *B* : vatum metuens *unus Heinsii* : varium metuens *Datanus* * omina AI^2 *(i. mg.)* $BCDE_1E_2GMOx_1^2$ (ogmina Ox_1) *TV* (omnia *Luck)* V_2 *(i. ras.)* X_2, *Wittianus* : omnia $HIOOx_2PX_1$, *ed. pr. min. 1472* **10** placant *ω* : placent *G* (a *s. l. corr.* G^2), *ed. Lipsiensis 1500* : placeant PX_1

Et tamen, utcumque est, sive illi vera monenti,
  mendaci somno credere sive solent,
efficiat vanos noctis Lucina timores
  et frustra immeritum pertimuisse velit,
si mea nec turpi mens est obnoxia facto
  nec laesit magnos impia lingua deos.
Iam nox aetherium nigris emensa quadrigis
  mundum caeruleo laverat amne rotas,
nec me sopierat menti deus utilis aegrae:
  Somnus sollicitas deficit ante domos.
Tandem, cum summo Phoebus prospexit ab ortu,
  pressit languentis lumina sera quies.
Hic iuvenis casta redimitus tempora lauro
  est visus nostra ponere sede pedem.

---

19 _f_ (sopierat) _g_ (menti sopor utilis egre est)

11 et ω, _edd._ : sed _Guyetus ex Thuaneo, Heyne, De Golbéry, Müller_ : at _susp. Dissen, Damsté 207_ * utcumque ω : utrumque _B_Ox_1 (utcumque _i. mg._ Ox_1^2) $PV_2X_1X_2$, _Askewianus, Datanus, ed. Romana 1475_ * illi _codd._ : illis _Dissen, prob. Tränkle_ : a dis _Eden_ * monenti CDE_2G^2 _(ex corr.)_ MX_2, _Askewianus_[2], _Bergomas, Brixianus, Muretus, Heyne-Wunderlich, De Golbéry, dub. Postgate_ : moneri ω, _edd._ : moveri _BI_ (n _s. l._ I^2) Ox_1, _Wittianus_ : monentur _Herrmann_ **12** solent _Postgate, quod receperunt Némethy et Tränkle_ : volent ω : velint _CT, Askewianus_ : nolent Ox_2 **13** Lucina _codd._ : Lucifer _Herrmann_ * timores _codd._ : tremores _Müller_ **14** pertimuisse ω, _plerique edd._ : pertinuisse _A_ (pertimuisse _s. l. corr._ A^2) _M (ut vidi)_ : praetimuisse _Vindobonensis, Gebhardus ex coni., quod ediderunt Broukhusius, Vulpius, Heyne-Wunderlich, De Golbéry et nuper Luck_ * velit ω : vellet _P_ **15** si ω : sic $CMTX_2$, _Brixianus, Datanus, edd. pr. min. 1472 et Lipsiensis 1500_ : dii E_1P, _ed. Pinelliana 1472_ **16** magnos ω : magicos _T (ex Tib. 1.2.64)_ **17** aetherium _G_ : (a)ethereum ω * emensa DE_2I^2 (n _s. l._) MV^2 _(i. mg.)_ X_2, _Askewianus, Datanus, edd. pr. mai. 1472 et Basiliensis 1530, Muretus_ : emersa $ABE_1HIOOx_2PTVX_1$, _Bergomas, Brixianus, edd. vett._ : demensa Ox_1V_2 : dimensa _G, Florentinus Statii_ : eversa _C_ **18** caeruleo ω : caeruleas _Scaliger ex cod., Broukhusius ex coni._ : Lethaeo _Guelferbyt. 3 Heynii_ **20** deficit ante _codd._ : deficit ille _vel_ desit is ante _Heinsius (ad Ov. Met. 2.382 et in Ex adversariis c. 1 et in Notae in Tib.)_ : deserit ille _Luck, Heinsium (ad Ov. Met. 2.382) et Broukhusium secutus_ **21** summo ... ab ortu ω : summo ... ab Oeta _Markland (ad Stat. Silv. 2.2.45)_ : summa ... ab Oeta _Müller, prob. Némethy_ * summo ω : somno MX_2, _ed. pr. mai. 1472_ : somnos Ox_2 * prospexit ω : perspexit _G (ut vidi clara luce)_ **22** languentis ω : languenti _Havet, quod recepit Pichard_ * sera ω : vera _B_ : serta Ox_2 : fessa CV_2^2 _(i. mg.), Wittianus, ed. pr. min. 1472_ : victa _H_ * lauro _codd._ : lauru _Broukhusius, quem Heyne-Wunderlich et Voss secuti sunt_ **24** est ω : et _P_ * pedem ω : pedes _O (corr._ O^2_)_

Non vidit quicquam formosius ulla priorum
 aetas, humanum nec fuit illud opus.
Intonsi crines longa cervice fluebant,
 stillabat Syrio myrrhea rore coma.
Candor erat qualem praefert Latonia Luna,
 et color in niveo corpore purpureus,
ut iuveni primum virgo deducta marito
 inficitur teneras ore rubente genas,
et cum contexunt amarantis alba puellae
 lilia et autumno candida mala rubent.
Ima videbatur talis alludere palla:
 namque haec in nitido corpore vestis erat.
Artis opus rarae, fulgens testudine et auro
 pendebat laeva garrula parte lyra.

25-26 *post v. 38 coll. Herrmann non recte* **25** vidit *Heyne* : vidit vel tulit *infra* illo *scr.* X_2^2 * illo ω : ullo *C* * quicquam ω : quiquam E_2 **26** aetas humanum nec fuit illud opus MX_2, *unus Statii, coni. Heyne, quem sequuntur Dissen, Castiglioni, Luck* : aetas humanum nec videt illud opus *codd. fere omnes, vett. edd., Smith, Lenz-Galinsky (cf. Vahlen, Opuscula I 363-366)* : aetas aut hominum nunc videt ulla domus *susp. Cartault, prob. Tescari et Lee* : aetas heroum nec tulit ulla domus *susp. Lachmann, quod ediderunt Müller, Némethy et Ponchont* : aetas humanum nec videt ulla domus *Postgate (CQ 6 [1912] 41-42 et ed. 1915²)* : aetas humanum nec tulit ille decus *Baehrens, prob. Pichard* : aetas humanum nec tulit artis opus *Bignone (RF 38 [1910] 416-418)* : aetas aut hominum nunc videt artis opus *Tescari (Convivium, 1938, 237), sed in editione sua Cartault secutus est* * humanum *codd.* : aut hominum *Cartault* : heroum *Lachmann* * nec fuit MX_2, *unus Statii* : nec videt ω : nunc videt *Cartault* : nec valet Ox_2 *(videt i. mg.* Ox_2^2*)* : nec dedit *dub. Heinsius (Notae in Tib.)* : nec tulit *Lachmann* * illud opus *codd.* : ulla domus *Lachmann* : ille decus *Baehrens, prob. Pichard* : artis opus *Bignone l. c.* **28** stillabat ω, *plerique edd.* : spirabat *Vindobonensis, unus Broukhusii, Fabricius (ad Ter. Ad. 117), ed. Plantiniana 1569, Passeratius, Voss, Heyne-Wunderlich, Bach* * syrio *Bernensis, Broukhusius 'ex emendatione doctorum virorum'* : tyrio ω *(cf. app. crit. ad Lygd. 6.63)* * myrr(h)ea *vel* murrea G^2 *(r s. l.), Muretus ex codd., Némethy ex coni. Cyllenii (cf. Hor. Od. 3.14.22)* : myrt(h)ea *vel* mirt(h)ea ω, *edd. Aldinae 1502 et 1515* **29** praefert *codd.* : profert *ed. Pinelliana 1472* **31** ut ω : et *P* * iuveni ω : iuvenis E_1^2 *(s add. sec. manu)* * virgo ω : iuveni E_1, *ed. Pinelliana 1472* **32** rubente *codd.* : nitente *Baehrens* **33-34** et . . . et ω, *plerique edd.* : ut . . . et *C, Wittianus, ed. Plantiniana 1569* : aut . . . et *Itali, Puccius, Wunderlich, Baehrens* : ut . . . ut *Broukhusius ex coni., quem Vulpius, Heyne, Voss, Huschke, Bach et De Golbéry secuti sunt, denuo coni. Havet, queod receperunt Pichard et Tescari (Convivium, 1938, 237 et ed.)* : aut . . . ut *Luck* **33** amarant(h)is ω : aramantis *H* : adamantis E_1, *Bergomas, ed. Pinelliana 1472* : amaricis *C, edd. pr. min. et Bartoliniana 1472* **35** ima ω : iamque *G* * alludere *Cyllenius ex cod., def. Allen (CR 20 [1906] 456)* : inludere *codd.* **36** namque ω : nam *C* * h(a)ec ω : hic Ox_1 *(corr.* Ox_1^2*, ut vid.)* V_2 : aequa *susp. Baehrens*

Hanc primum veniens plectro modulatus eburno
  felices cantus ore sonante dedit.
Sed postquam fuerant digiti cum voce locuti,
  edidit haec dulci tristia verba modo:
«Salve, cura deum, casto nam rite poetae
  Phoebusque et Bacchus Pieridesque favent.
Sed proles Semelae Bacchus doctaeque sorores
  dicere non norunt quid ferat hora sequens;
at mihi fatorum leges aevique futuri
  eventura pater posse videre dedit.
Quare ego quae dico non fallax accipe vates
  quodque deus vero Cynthius ore feram.
Tantum cara tibi quantum nec filia matri,
  quantum nec cupido bella puella viro,
pro qua sollicitas caelestia numina votis,
  quae tibi securos non sinit ire dies
et, cum te fusco Somnus velavit amictu,
  vanum nocturnis fallit imaginibus,
carminibus celebrata tuis formosa Neaera
  alterius mavult esse puella viri,

---

39 hanc ω : hac *B, coni. Wunderlich* : ac Ox_2 * primum ω : *om. H* * veniens ω : feriens *Burmann, prob. Luck* * modulatus ω : modulatur *OP*
40 sonante ω : canente DE_2, *ed. Romana 1475, Cyllenius* **42** h(a)ec ω : hic V_2 *(corr.* V_2^2*)* : et X_2 * dulci tristia *Bernensis, Broukhusius ex codd., plerique edd. recc., def. Helm (PhW 58 [1938] 889 et ed.)* : tristi dulcia ω, *edd. vett., Cartault, Havet, Calonghi, def. Schuster 156, nuper ediderunt Lenz-Galinsky et Lee* * modo ω : sono *B, Datanus, Askewianus* **43** casto ω : vasto *H* **45** semel(a)e $ABE_1^2IOx_1^2$ *(*e *del.)* $Ox_2VV_2X_1$, *Wittianus, Broukhusius, quem sequuntur Vulpius, Voss, De Golbéry, Baehrens, Postgate, Cartault, Pichard, Ponchont, Levy, Tescari, Lenz-Galinsky et Tränkle* : semelee Ox_1 : semeles CDE_2HMOPX_2, *Askewianus, Brixianus, Datanus, edd. vett., Muretus, Statius, Heyne-Wunderlich, Lachmann, Dissen, Müller, Hiller, Némethy, Smith, Lenz-Galinsky, Luck et Lee* : semelis *G* : semelem E_1 * bacchus ω : liber *C* : mollis *susp. Damsté, cui* bacchus *glossa manifesta est* **46** non norunt ω : norunt non V_2 *(corr.* V_2^2*)* : non valent *C* * quid ferat hora sequens ω : quid sequens hora ferat *C* **47** (a)evique ω : acuique *C* : cuique *M* Ox_1^2 *(*cui *s. l.; ras. +* que Ox_1*)* TVV_2 *(*evique *corr.* V_2^2*)* : cuiusque *G (*aevique *i. mg.* G^2*)* Ox_2V^2 *(s. l.)* **48** eventura ω : et ventura *P* * pater . . . dedit ω : dedit . . . pater *Brixianus* **49** qu(a)e ω : quod *B* * dico *codd.* : dicam *Tränkle* **50** quodque DE_1E_2GMP, *Brixianus, ed. pr. min. 1472* : quodve *C* : quidque ω, *ed. pr. mai. 1472* : quamque *Postgate (CQ 6 [1912] 42; 10 [1916] 191 et ed.* 1515^2*)* : quique *Havet, quod Pichard recepit* * feram *Broukhusius ex coni.* : ferat ω : feret *I (*a *s. l. corr.* I^2*)* : ferar *Havet, quod Pichard recepit, denuo coni. Postgate (l. c.)* : favet *C* **51** tibi ω : mihi *C* **54** ire ω *(i. ras.* V_2*)* : esse *C (s. l. corr.* C^2*)* Ox_1, *ed. pr. min. 1472* * dies ω : deos *B* **56** fallit ω : ludit Ox_1V_2 *(*fallit *i. mg.* V_2^2*), Guelferbyt. 3 Heynii* **57** ne(a)era ω : nehera Ox_1^2 *(*h *s. l.)* V_2X_1 : nerea *C*

diversasque tuis agitat mens impia curas,
  nec gaudet casta nupta Neaera domo.
A crudele genus nec fidum femina nomen!
  A pereat, didicit fallere si qua virum!
Sed flecti poterit (mens est mutabilis illis):
  tu modo cum multa bracchia tende prece.
Saevus Amor docuit validos temptare labores,
  saevus Amor docuit verbera posse pati.
Me quondam Admeti niveas pavisse iuvencas
  non est in vanum fabula ficta iocum:
tunc ego nec cithara poteram gaudere sonora
  nec similes chordis reddere voce sonos,

---

63 *g* (mens est mutabilis illis) **66** *f*

59 tuis *Vindobonensis, Lipsius ex coni., prob. Broukhusius, Vulpius, Tescari (Convivium, 1938, 237 et ed.), Herrmann, Luck, Lee et Tränkle* : suas *ω, plerique edd. vett. et recc.* : suis *Muretus, Dousa (Praecid. c. 11), Cartault, Pichard* * mens impia *ω, edd.* : mens anxia *Guelferbyt. 1 et 4 Heynii, edd. Romana 1475, Aldinae 1502 et 1515, Gryphiana 1551, Plantiniana 1569, Cyllenius, Statius* * curas *ω* : poenas E_2 **60** ne(a)era *ω* : nehera V_2 : nerea *ACV* : neerea X_1 **61** a *edd.* : ah *ω* : ha *ACIM* : hac *O* (c *del.* O^2) * femina *ω* : perfida *P* **62** a *edd.* : ah *ω* : ha $AIMOOx_1$ * ah (*vel* ha) pereat *ω* : ah pareat X_2 (e *s. l. corr.* X_2^2) : ah pepereat *H* : appareat *C* **63** sed *ω* : set Ox_1 : et BV_2 (sed *corr.* V_2^2) * illis *ω, edd. pr. min. et Pinelliana 1472, edd. fere omnes* : illi *GT, edd. pr. mai. 1472, Aldinae 1502 et 1515, Muretus, Statius* **64** prece $GHPV^2$ (*i. mg.*), *exc. Pocchi, Petrei et Lipsii, Broukhusius, nonn. edd.* : fide *ω, Askewianus, Brixianus, Datanus, Wittianus, Muretus, nonn. edd. vett et recc., def. Vahlen (Opuscula I 357 n. 15)* **65** *ab hoc versu F incepisse videtur* * saevus amor docuit validos temptare labores *F, Vindobonensis, agnoscunt Puccius et Petreius in exc., restituit Scaliger ex F* : s(a)evus (scevus *H*) amor docuit domin(a)e fera (ferre *P*) verba (bella MX_2) minantis $BCDE_1E_2HMO$ (*post v. 67; translatio indic. cum* .T.; *i. mg. dext.* AURISPA) Ox_1T (*ab eadem manu sed litteris minoribus scriptus*) V_2X_2, *Brixianus* : *om. A (lacunam postea ind.) I (i. mg. dext.* def.*[= deficit]) V* : flere nec ante pedes pudeat dominamque vocare G^2 (*i. ras. vid.*), *Petreius a Pontano esse effictum monuit* : te victum (vinctum X_1) placidumque (placitumque, t *s. l.* Ox_2^2) tuae monstrato puellae Ox_2V^2 (*in calce*) * validos *codd. et edd.* : varios *Müller* : duros *vel* humiles *susp. Tränkle* * labores *codd.* : leones *Huschke* **66** s(a)evus *ω* : scevus *H, ed Pinelliana 1472* : tuus X_1 * posse *fω* : saeva *F, def. Vahlen (Opuscula I 357-358), Helm (PhW 47 [1927] 1392) et Schuster 157, ediderunt Levy (1927) et Cartault* **67** niveas . . . iuvencas *ω, plerique edd.* : niveos . . . iuvencos CDE_2V_2, *Brixianus, Wittianus, ed. Romana 1475, Broukhusius ex codd., quem Heyne-Wunderlich et De Golbéry secuti sunt* : niveas . . . puellas Ox_2 (iuvencas *i. mg.* Ox_2^2) **69** nec (ne *Eboracensis*) cithara *ω* : cithara nec V_2 * sonora *ω* : severa V_2 (*corr.* V_2^2) : canora *recc., Voss, Baehrens, Pichard, Herrmann* **70** nec *ω* : non *B* : ne *Eboracensis* * chordis $DGHI^2$ (h *s. l.*) V^2 (h *s. l.*) : cordis *ω* * voce *ω* : posse *BC*

sed permulcenti cantum meditabar avena
ille ego Latonae filius atque Iovis.
Nescis quid sit amor, iuvenis, si ferre recusas
immitem dominam coniugiumque ferum.
Ergo ne dubita blandas adhibere querellas:
vincuntur molli pectora dura prece.
Quod si vera canunt sacris oracula templis,
haec illi nostro nomine dicta refer:
"hoc tibi coniugium promittit Delius ipse;
felix hoc, alium desine velle virum"».
Dixit, et ignavus defluxit corpore somnus.
A ego ne possim tanta videre mala.
Nec tibi crediderim votis contraria vota
nec tantum crimen pectore inesse tuo.
Nam te nec vasti genuerunt aequora ponti
nec flammam volvens ore chimaera fero

---

76 *gv, Vincent. Bellov.* **86** *v* (ore Chimaera fero)

71 sed permulcenti *Huschke coni. (ap. Dissen 356 et De Golbéry 216)* : sed perlucenti (pellucenti *DE_2*) ω, *edd. fere omnes, sed nonn. hunc locum desperatum nondum expeditum putant* : sed perducenti *ed. Pinelliana 1472* : saepe policenti *Ox_1* (sed perlucenti *i. mg.* *Ox_1^2*) *V_2* : sed praecludenti *Delz (MH 48 [1991] 61-62)* * cantum ω, *ed. pr. mai. 1472* : tantum *E_1* : cantus *CDE_2V_2*, *Brixianus, Cuiacianus (corr. ex* cantu*), edd. pr. min. 1472, Aldina 1502 et Plantiniana 1569* : cantu *X_2* : carmen *P* **72** iovis ω : locus *P* **73** nescis *codd.* : nescit *edd. pr. min. 1472, Aldinae 1502 et 1515* * sit ω : scit *P* * si ω : *om.* *V_2* *(add. s. l.* *V_2^2*) * ferre ω : forte *C* * recusas ω : recuses *MX_2* (sas *s. l. corr.* *X_2^2*) **74** dominam ω : dominum *Broukhusius ex uno Bodleiano (= Amor)* **78** h(a)ec ω : nec *PV_2* *(corr.* *V_2^2*) : hoc *B* * nomine *codd.* : numine *Herrmann* **79** hoc ω : haec *H* : tibi ω : mihi *MX_2^2* *(s. l.)* : promittit *codd.* : permittit *Langermann* **80** hoc *F (teste in castigationibus Scaligero, qui in ed. Plantiniana 1569, quae hoc exhibet, nil adnotavit), Muretus ex 'vetere libro'* : ac ω : ast *I^2* *(s. l.)* : at *ed. pr. min. 1472* : ah *susp. Heinsius (Notae in Tib.)* : ergo *exc. Petrei et Lipsii* : ecce *Baehrens in app. crit.* **81** defluxit ω, *edd. pr. min. 1472, Aldinae 1502 et 1515* : deflexit *V_2*, *edd. pr. mai. 1472 et Lipsiensis 1500* * corpore ω, *edd. pr. mai et min. 1472, Aldina 1515* : pectore *D, Scaliger ex ed. Aldina 1502, Broukhusius, Vulpius et Heyne (cf. Ov. Tr. 4.3.22, Ponto 3.3.12)* **82** a *edd.* : ha *ACI* : ah ω *(cf. [Tib.] 3.17.3; ThLL 5.2.272.62-63)* : hac *O* : huc *P* : haec *E_1*, *Brixianus, ed. Pinelliana 1472* * ne possim ω, *edd. pr. min. 1472, Romana 1475 et Aldina 1515, Muretus, Statius, Pulmann, Passeratius, Heyne-Wunderlich, edd. recc. fere omnes* : ne possum *I* (possim *corr.* *I^2*) *O^2* (ne *i. mg.*) *P* : non possim *E_2M*, *Brixianus, ed. Vicentina 1481* : non possum *DE_1GO*, *edd. pr. mai. 1472, Veneta 1475, Regiensis 1481, Lipsienses 1487 et 1490, Venetae 1491 et 1943, Aldina 1502, Broukhusius, Vulpius et Baehrens* **83** nec ω : h(a)ec *C (corr.* *C^2*) *P* : ah *X_2* : non *M, Guyetus ex Thuaneo et duobus Statii* * tibi ω : ego *MX_2*, *Guyetus ex Thuaneo et duobus Statii* : votis *codd.* : nostris *Wunderlich* **84** pectore ω : pectori *HOx_1V^2* (i *s. l.*), *Scaliger, Broukhusius* * tuo ω : meo *Ox_2* (tuo *corr.* *Ox_2^2*) : toto *H* **85** nam ω : nec *H* **86** flammam ω : flammas *E_2H* * volvens ω : evolvens *dub. Heinsius (Notae in Tib.)* * ore ω : ora *H* * fero ω : suo *H*

nec canis anguina redimitus terga caterva,
cui tres sunt linguae tergeminumque caput,
Scyllaque virgineam canibus succincta figuram,
nec te conceptam saeva leaena tulit,
barbara nec Scythiae tellus horrendave Syrtis;
sed culta et duris non habitanda domus
et longe ante alias omnes mitissima mater
isque pater quo non alter amabilior.
Haec deus in melius crudelia somnia vertat
et iubeat tepidos irrita ferre Notos.

---

87 nec ω : non *Eboracensis* * canis anguina *Postgate, quem Pichard et Luck sequuntur* : canis anguinea $BE_2GOx_1V^2$ *(i. mg.)* V_2X_1, *Askewianus, Bergomas, Brixianus, Cuiacianus, Datanus, Wittianus, edd. pr. min. 1472, Aldinae 1502 et 1515, Plantiniana 1569, Muretus, Statius, plerique edd. a Voss, Huschke, Dissen, Lachmann usque ad Tränkle* : canis anguiguena Ox_2 : consanguinea $ACDE_1HIMOTVX_2$, *Eboracensis, edd. pr. mai. et Pinelliana 1472, Cyllenius, Passeratius, Broukhusius, Vulpius* : cum sanguinea *P* * caterva ω : catena *T* **89-90** *hoc distichon spurium putabat Guyetus* **89** Scyllaque ω : Scyllave *Heyne ex Bernensi, Voss, Pichard* * succincta FX_2^2 (c *post* n *add. s. l.*), *cf. Verg. Ecl. 6.75, Ciris 59* : succinta MX_2, *ed. pr. min. 1472* : subcinta *C* : submixta ω, *ed. pr. mai. 1472, Pichard* : submista V_2 : summista *G* : subnixa Ox_2 : comitata *Askewianus, Datanus* : commixta *Cyllenius* : commissa *dub. Heinsius (Notae in Tib.)* : subnixa *vel* subtexa *Castiglione* **90** s(a)eva ω : sceva *H, ed. pr. min. 1472* * tulit ω : dedit *H, cf. Tib. 2.5.91* **91** Scythiae tellus ω : tellus Scythiae *C* **92** et ω : *om.* V_2 (et *s. l. add.* V_2^2) * duris ω : diris *Guelferbyt. 1 et 4 Heynii, edd. Veneta 1491, Aldinae 1502 et 1515, Muretus, ed. Plantiniana 1569* **93** et ω : sed MX_2, *Bach* * alias omnes ω : omnes alias HMX_2, *Brixianus* * alias ω, *plerique edd.* : alios *G (corr.* G^2*), edd. pr. mai. 1472, Aldinae 1502 et 1515, Scaliger* **95-96** *om. H (post 94 + hab.)* **95** crudelia ω : crudelis *Zwic. 2 Heynii, edd. pr. mai. 1472 et Lipsiensis 1500* **96** irrita $CE_2V_2^2$ *(i. mg.), edd. pr. min. 1472, Aldinae 1502 et 1515, omnes edd. recc. (cf. Lygd. 6.50)* : impia ω, *edd. pr. mai. et Pinelliana 1472* * notos ω : nothos $CE_2Ox_2V_2^2$ (h *s. l.*) : nodos *OP*

V

Vos tenet, Etruscis manat quae fontibus unda,
unda sub aestivum non adeunda Canem,
nunc autem sacris Baiarum proxima lymphis,
cum se purpureo vere remittit humus.
At mihi Persephone nigram denuntiat horam:
immerito iuveni parce nocere, dea.
Non ego temptavi nulli temeranda virorum
audax laudandae sacra docere deae,
nec mea mortiferis infecit pocula sucis
dextera nec cuiquam trita venena dedit,

---

1 vos G^2 *(*v *i. mg.)* TV^2 *(*v *s. l.), ed. pr. mai. 1472, Muretus* : nos ω, *edd. pr. min. 1472, Aldinae 1502 et 1515* * etruscis ω : et tuscis Ox_1 * manat qu(a)e ω : manatque V_2 (quae *corr.* V_2^2) : manetque *C* : manant qu(a)e *M* * qu(a)e fontibus ω : quae e fontibus E_2, *ed. Romana 1475* * fontibus ω : montibus *Brixianus*^{2} *(ssc.), unus Statii et Broukhusius, Vossiani 1 et 5 Heynii* : sedilibus *C* **3** nunc autem ω : aemula nunc *Cartault servata voce* maxima * sacris baiarum ω : baiarum sacris E_1 * proxima *Scioppius (Parad. literar. 16 ss.), Heinsius ex coni. (Ex adversariis cap. I et in Notae in Tib.), plerique edd. a Broukhusio et Vulpio* : maxima ω, *ed. Plantiniana 1569, Heyne-Wunderlich, Cartault, Pichard, dub. Lenz-Galinsky in app. crit.* : maxime *P* **4** humus ω, *edd. Pinelliana 1472 et Aldina 1515, Muretus, Statius, Pulmann et edd. recc.* : hyems MX_2 (humus *i. mg.* X_2^2), *Scaliger ex ed. Aldina 1502, quem Broukhusius, Vulpius et Heyne secuti sunt* : yems *C* **5** at ω : ah E_2T : aut Ox_2 * persephone ω : persiphone CV_2 *(corr.* V_2^2*)* : persophone *B* : thissiphone *Askewianus* : thesiphone *P, Datanus* * horam ω : oram Ox_1P (h *s. l. add.* P^2) V_2 : iram *H* **7** temeranda ω : tentanda *H* * virorum *Askewianus, Vindobonensis, Scaliger ex Cuiaciano, edd. recc.* : deorum ω, *edd. vett.* : piorum *exc. Colotii, Huschke* : reorum *Sandbach (CR 2 [1952] 7), prob. Lee* **8** laudandae ω : celandae *Heinsius (Notae in Tib.), dub. Broukhusius ex exc. Petrei et uno Vaticano* * sacra docere ω, *edd.* : sacra movere *Vossinanus 2 Heynii, Hiller* : sacra videre *Erath* : cernere sacra *Voss (cf. Ov. Met. 3.710)* : sacra subire *vel* prodere sacra *Heinsius (l. c.)* : noscere *vel* discere sacra *Heyne* **9** sucis *edd. e Baehrens* : succis *codd.* **10** trita *F teste Scaligero in Castig., prob. Heinsius, plerique edd. ab Lachmann* : certa ω, *edd. vett.* : t(a)etra G^2 *(i. l.,* certa *G), unus Statii, Scaliger ex coni., Broukhusius, Heyne-Wunderlich, De Golbéry, Luck* : terra *M* * dedit *codd., edd.* : dedi *ed. Aldina 1515, Statius*

nec nos sacrilegi templis admovimus ignes,
  nec cor sollicitant facta nefanda meum,
nec nos insana meditantes iurgia mente
  impia in adversos solvimus ora deos,
et nondum cani nigros laesere capillos,
  nec venit tardo curva senecta pede.
Natalem primo nostrum videre parentes,
  cum cecidit fato consul uterque pari.
Quid fraudare iuvat vitem crescentibus uvis
  et modo nata mala vellere poma manu?
Parcite, pallentes undas quicumque tenetis
  duraque sortiti tertia regna dei.
Elysios olim liceat cognoscere campos
  Lethaeamque ratem Cimmeriosque lacus,

---

12 *g, Vincent. Bellov.* (sollicitant pectus facta nefanda reum) **15** *g, Vincent. Bellov.* **16** *gv, Vincent. Bellov.* **19-20** *fg, Vincent. Bellov.*

11 sacrilegi $E_2HV_2^2$ *(s del.), ed. Romana 1475, Scaliger ex Cuiaciano, Lachmann, Smith, Pichard, Lenz-Galinsky, Luck* : sacrilegis *ω, Askewianus, Datanus* : sacrilegos I^2 *(o s. l.)* DE_1GMOTX_2*, Askewianus*[2]*, Bergomas, Brixianus, Eboracensis, edd. Vicentina 1481 et Plantiniana 1569, plerique edd.* : sortilegis I^2 *(i. mg. sin.)* * admovimus ignes E_2G^2 *(s. l.), edd. pr. min. 1472, Romana 1475, Vicentina 1481, Aldinae 1502 et 1515, Plantiniana 1569, plerique edd.* : amovimus (a)egros *ABGIOPVX*$_1$*, Cartault, Pichard, Calonghi, Lenz-Galinsky, def. Schuster 157-160* : amovimus agros *H* : ammovimus agros Ox_1 : amovimus egris *T* : admovimus (a)egros DE_1I^2 *(ad s. l.)* MX_2*, Bergomas, Brixianus, Eboracensis, ed. pr. mai. 1472, def. Belling (1893) 89-90* : admovimus ergo *Scaliger ex Cuiaciano* : ammovimus aegros Ox_2V_2 : admonibus agros *C* : amovimus ignes G^3 *(*ignes *i. mg.), Luck* : admovimus ullos X_2^2 *(*ullos *i. mg.)* : amovimus aera *Helm (PhW 58 [1938] 890 et ed.)* : admovimus ungues *L. Koenen (ICS 1 [1976] 129 n. 11)* **12** facta *codd.* : furta *Baehrens* * meum *ω* : reum *g, Vincent. Bellov. (Speculum 4.107)* **13** insana . . . mente *Lipsius, quod ediderunt Broukhusius, Vulpius et nuper Luck* : insanae . . . mentis *ω, ed. Pinelliana 1472, plerique edd. recc.* : insanae . . . linguae $CDE_2V_2^2$ *(i. mg.), Bergomas (i. mg.), Brixianus (corr. sec. manu), Wittianus (corr. sec. manu), edd. pr. mai et min. 1472, Aldinae 1502 et 1515, Statius, Heyne-Wunderlich* * meditantes *G, Bergomas, edd. pr. min. 1472, Aldina 1515 et Plantiniana 1569* : meditantis *ω* : molitantis Ox_2 **14** adversos *codd., plerique edd.* : aversos *Broukhusius coni., quod Luck recepit* **15** et nondum *ω* : sepe quidem *g, Vincent. Bellov. (Speculum 5.100)* * nigros *ω* : trigeos *B* **16** nec venit *ω* : saepe venit *g, Vincent. Bellov. l. c.* * tardo *vω, edd.* : tacito *g, Vincent. Bellov. l. c., def. Baligan (St. pubbl. Ist. Filol. Class. Univ. Bologna I [1948] 31)* * curva *ω* : nigra Ox_2 **17** primo nostrum *ω, ed. pr. min. 1472, plerique edd. recc.* : primo nostri BOx_1Ox_2*, Datanus* : nostri primum *edd. pr. mai. 1472 et Romana 1475, Broukhusius ex Wittiano, quem Heyne-Wunderlich et De Golbéry secuti sunt* **18** *hunc versum spurium esse putat Broukhusius, sequente eius auctoritatem Vulpio, cui etiam hexameter huius distichi suspectus est* * cecidit *codd.* : cessit *Ayrmann (Vita Tibulli §§ 97-98)* * fato *ω* : facto *HV (corr.* V^2*)* **20** vellere *ω* : l(a)edere MX_2 **21** undas *ω, ed. Pinelliana 1472, Muretus, Broukhusius, edd. recc.* : umbras DE_2H*, Brixianus, edd. Romana 1475, Aldinae 1502 et 1515, Venetae 1491 et 1493, Scaliger* **22-23** *desunt in D* **22** duraque *codd.* : diraque *Housman* : ruraque *Damsté 207-208* **23** liceat *codd, edd.* : libeat *suspici (cf. Prop. 3.5.25)*

cum mea rugosa pallebunt ora senecta
  et referam pueris tempora prisca senex.
Atque utinam vano nequiquam torrear aestu,
  languent ter quinos sed mea membra dies.
At vobis Tuscae celebrantur numina lymphae,
  et facilis lenta pellitur unda manu.
Vivite felices, memores et vivite nostri,
  sive erimus seu nos fata fuisse velint.
Interea nigras pecudes promittite Diti
  et nivei lactis pocula mixta mero.

---

25 _v_ (rugosa senecta) **31** _v_

25 pallebunt _ω_ : squallebunt _susp. Heinsius (Notae in Tib.)_ **26** pueris _ω_ : pueri _T_ **27** atque utinam vano _ω_ : at utinam vario _C_ * nequiquam _edd. recc. e Postgate_ : nequicquam _ω, edd. pr. min. 1472, Aldinae_ 1502 et 1515 : necquicquam _AHI, Askewianus, Brixianus_ : nec quicquam $OOx_1V_2X_1$, _edd. pr. mai. et Pinelliana 1472_ : nequidquam _Heyne_ * torrear HOx_1X_2, _ed. pr. min. 1472, Guyetus ex Vaticano Statii, Guelferbyt. 3 Heynii, Luck_ : torreat _M_ : terrear _ω, plerique edd. vett. et fere omnes recc._ : terreat BCE_1Ox_2, _edd. pr. mai. 1472 et Lipsiensis 1500_ **28** sed _ω_ : iam COx_1V_2, _Guelferbyt. 3 Heynii, susp. Voss_ **29** at $BGOx_1Ox_2V_2X_1$, _Eboracensis, Brixianus, Lachmanniani, Muretus_ : atque ADE_1E_2IOPTV, _edd. pr. mai. et Pinelliana 1472, Romana 1475, Aldinae 1502 et 1515_ : et $CHMX_2$, _ed. pr. min. 1472_ * vobis $GPOx_2V_2$, _Muretus_ : nobis _ω, edd. pr. min. et Pinelliana 1472_ : mihi DE_2, _edd. pr. mai. 1472, Romana 1475, Aldinae 1502 et 1515_ * celebrantur _ω_ : celebrentur _Askewianus, Datanus_ * numina _ω_ : lumina _I (corr._ I^2_)_ X_1 : flumina _susp. Heinsius (Notae in Tib.)_ : gramina _Broukhusius ex Colbertino qui hab._ carmine _et Thuaneo qui hab._ carmina * lymph(a)e _ω_ : nymphae _HV (corr._ V^2_), Askewianus, Eboracensis_ **31** et _ω, edd._ : at _G, Herrmann_ : sed _C, exc. Lipsii, ed. pr. min. 1472_ : o _Voss_ **32** sive . . . seu _ω_ : seu . . . seu _C_ * nos _ω_ : non _C, Bergomas (i. mg._ nos_)_ * fata _ω_ : facta _HI_ * velint _ω, edd. fere omnes_ : volent _H, unus Statii, Broukhusius, Vulpius, Heyne-Wunderlich, De Golbéry et nuper Luck_ **33** promittite _ω_ : perquirite Ox_2

VI

Candide Liber, ades—sic sit tibi rustica vitis
semper, sic hedera tempora vincta feras—
aufer et ipse meum patera medicante dolorem:
saepe tuo cecidit munere victus Amor.
Care puer, madeant generoso pocula baccho;
en, nobis prona funde Falerna manu.
Ite procul durum curae genus, ite labores:
fulserit hic niveis Delius alitibus.
Vos modo proposito dulces faveatis amici,
neve neget quisquam me duce se comitem,

VI 2 *f* (edera) **7** *g, Vincent. Bellov.*

1 sic ω : si *C* : *om. P* * rustica *scripsi ex duo codd. ap. Broukhusium (cf. Tib. 1.10.26)* : mystica ω, *edd.* : candida *edd. pr. mai. 1472 et Vicentina 1481* * vitis ω : victis *ABI (corr.* I^2*) OV* (c *expunctum)* **2** semper sic hedera ω, *prob. Castelli (RSC 21 [1973] 114-116)* : sic hedera semper CE_1E_2HP, *Brixianus, ed. pr. mai. 1472 et Veneta 1475* * tempora *codd.* : cornua *Statius, quod Voss recepit* * vincta ω : iuncta *ed. Pinelliana 1472* : cincta *Castelli vid. def. l. c.* * feras ω, *prob. Castelli l. c.* : geras *DGH, Florentinus Statii, ed. Plantiniana 1569, Broukhusius ex nonn. codd., Heyne-Wunderlich, De Golbéry et Luck* **3** aufer et ω, *edd.* : aufer at MX_2 : adfer et *Wacker (Amoen. 72), prob. Luck* * ipse ω : om. *O (*ipse *ante* et *errabunde add.* O^2*)* * meum ω : mecum Ox_2 : metum *P* : merum *Wacker (l. c.), prob. Luck* * patera medicante *Waardenburg, def. Leo (GGA, 1898, 57)* : patera medicare *Birt (Ad hist. hexam. lat. symb. [Bonn. 1876] 47), prob. Tränkle* : pater et medicare *Wacker (l. c.), prob. Luck* : pariter medicando (meditanto V_2) ω : pariter medicande *B, Statius coni. in comm., prob. Guyetus, edidit Broukhusius, quem Heyne-Wunderlich et De Golbéry secuti sunt, denuo Pichard, def. Wilhelm (NJb 147 [1893] 769; 149 [1895] 775) et Schuster 160-162* : pariter medicate *Huschke* **4** cecidit *codd.* : cessit *malebat Broukhusius* : cedit *Heinsius* * munere ω : numine *Guelferbyt. 3 Heynii* * victus ω : vinctus X_2 * Amor *De Golbéry, Belling (1897) 70 n., Némethy, Postgate 1915²*, *Lee* : amor ω : auctor V_2 **5** c(h)are ω : carpe *C* : larga *Mitscherlich (ad Hor. Od. 2.11.18)* : curre *Havet, quod Pichard recepit* **6** en *Müller (praef. XXV)* : et ω, *plerique edd.* : i *Vindobonensis, exc. Petrei, Scaliger ex coni., sequentibus eius auctoritatem Broukhusio, Vulpio, Heyne-Wunderlich, nuper Havet et Pichard* * prona ω : plena *Statius ex uno susp. (ad v. 62)* **7-8** *post v. 12 posuit Herrmann non recte* **7** durum curae ω : dirum curae *G, Florentinus Statii* : curae durum *g, Vincent. Bellov. (Speculum 4.75)* : durae *C (om.* curae*)* **8** fulserit ω : fluserit X_2, *unus Statii* : fulxerit *G* (s *s. l. corr.* G^2*) P*.: pulserit *AI* (f *s. l. corr.* I^2*) BO*Ox_1*TV* (f *s. l. corr.* V^2*)* X_1, *Datanus* : pulserat *Askewianus* (fulserit *i. mg.)* * hic niveis Delius ω : Idaliis hic Venus *Housmann* : hic niveis telifer *Herrmann* * niveis ω : iuvenis *ed. pr. min. 1472* : nitidis *exc. Lipsii* * Delius *codd.* : Euhius *susp. Baehrens, quem sequitur Lee* : Idalis *temp. Postgate (JPh 25 [1897] 60), sed* Delius *in ed.* * alitibus ω : alatibus *M* : altilibus E_1, *Vossianus 5 Heynii, ed. Pinelliana 1472* **10** comitem ω : quisquam *H*

aut siquis vini certamen mite recusat,
  fallat eum tecto cara puella dolo.
Ille facit dites animos deus, ille ferocem
  contudit et dominae misit in arbitrium,
Armenias tigres et fulvas ille leaenas
  vicit et indomitis mollia corda dedit.
Haec Amor et maiora valet. Sed poscite Bacchi
  munera: quem vestrum pocula sicca iuvant?
Convenit ex aequo nec torvus Liber in illis,
  qui se quique una vina iocosa colunt.
Convenit iratus nimium nimiusque severis:
  qui timet irati numina magna, bibat.

---

13 *g* **16** *g*

11 aut *ω* : at E_2H *(fort.* ast*), edd. Aldina 1515 et Plantiniana 1569, Wunderlich* : haud Ox_1V_2 * certamen mite *codd.* : certamen inire *Schrader* * recusat *ω, ed. Aldina 1515, Broukhusius* : recuset E_1HMPX_2, *Brixianus, Eboracensis, ed. pr. mai et min. 1472, Scaliger ex ed. Aldina 1502* **12** eum *ω* : cum $CMPTX_2$, *Lachmanniani* **13** dites *ω* : mites *exc. Lipsii, Voss, prob. Mitscherlich (ad Hor. I 368), susp. Wunderlich et Tränkle, ediderunt Némethy, Postgate* 1915^2 *et nuper Lee* * ferocem *ω* : feroces gGV_2 *(corr.* V_2^2*)* **14** contudit *ω* : contundit *I* : contulit *V (corr.* V^2*), Askewianus, Datanus* * domin(a)e *ω* : domini BOx_1 **15** armenias *ω* : armenas *AI* (i *s. l. add.* I^2*) O* (i *s. l. add.* O^2*)* Ox_2TVV_2 (i *s. l. add.* V_2^2*)* : armeniasque E_2, *Brixianus, edd. pr. mai. 1472 et Vicentina 1481, Bach, Luck* : armeniae *Broukhusius ex coni.* * fulvas . . . leaenas *ω* : fulvos . . . leones CX_2 (-vas . . . -nas *s. l.* X_2^2*), Voss* **16** vicit *ω* : vincit *C* : icit *Herrmann* **17** h(a)ec *ω* : nec *P* * valet *Askewianus, unus Statii, ed. Plantiniana 1569 i. mg. coni., Broukhusius ex cod., Fruterius ex coni.* : volet *ω* : nollet *Bergomas* * ba(c)chi *ω* : bacchum X_2 : bacche X_2^2 *(s. l. scr.)* **18** vestrum *ω* : nostrum *I, Voss ex duo codd.* **19** nec *ω* : non E_1E_2, *Brixianus, ed. Romana 1475* * illis *ω, edd. Pinelliana 1472 et Romana 1475, Broukhusius* : illos *D, edd. pr. mai et min. 1472, Aldina 1502 et Plantiniana 1569, Luck* : illo *Eboracensis* **20** quique *ω* : quis-que CPV_2, *nonn. codd. Statii* * vina *ω* : verba *Bolle* * colunt *ω* : bibunt *Postgate* **21** convenit *M, Lachmann ex coni., quem sequuntur Dissen, Müller, Baehrens, Némethy, Pichard, Tescari, Herrmann, Lenz-Galinsky et Lee* : non venit *ω, ed. pr. min. 1472* : iam venit $DE_1E_2V_2$, *Muretus, Statius, Scaliger ex ed. Aldina 1502, Broukhusius, Vulpio, Heyne* : nam venit *C, unus Statii, Livineius ex coni., De Golbéry, dub. Postgate in app. crit.* : quom venit *H* : nunc venit *Havet, quod Pichard et Ponchont receperunt* : at venit *Büchner (Hermes 93 [1965] 97), denuo Luck, sed multo ante susp. Wunderlich 311* : et venit *Cartault* * nimiusque *scripsi ex O* : nimiumque *ω, edd.* : nimisque *P* * severis *Bernensis, Livineius et Guilielmus ex coni., sequentibus eius auctoritatem Broukhusio et plerisque edd. recc.* : severus *ω, Herrmann* : securus *P* : severos *Lachmann coni., quem sequuntur Dissen, Müller, Baehrens, Némethy, Pichard, Tescari, Lenz-Galinsky et Lee* **22** bibat *ω* : bibit *C*

Quales his poenas qualis quantusque minetur,
  Cadmeae matris praeda cruenta docet.
Sed procul a nobis hic sit timor, illaque, si quis,
  quid valeat laesi sentiat ira dei.
Quid precor a, demens? venti temeraria vota,
  aeriae et nubes diripienda ferant.
Quamvis nulla mei superest tibi cura, Neaera,
  sis felix, et sint candida fata tua.
At nos securae reddamus tempora mensae:
  venit post multos una serena dies.
Ei mihi, difficile est imitari gaudia falsa,
  difficile est tristi fingere mente iocum,

33-36 _fg, Vincent. Bellov._

23 quales ω : qualis _CG, Havet, quod Pichard recepit_ * his ω : hiis _AO_ (i _prius del._ O^2) : iis E_2H, _ed. pr. mai. 1472_ : is _Brixianus_ : hic _Askewianus_ * qualis quantusque _Vindobonensis et Voss. 3 Heynii, Scaliger ex F, quod ediderunt Broukhusius, Vulpius, Heyne-Wunderlich et edd. recc. fere omnes_ : deus hic quantumque ω, _edd. Pinelliana 1472 et Aldina 1515, Muretus, Statius_ : deus hic quantasque _C, exc. Puccii, Guelferbyt. 1 et 3 Heynii, edd. pr. min. 1472 et Aldina 1502, Heinsius ex coni. (Notae in Tib.), nuper Luck_ : deus hic qu(a)ecumque GV^2 _(i. mg.)_ : deus hic quicunque E_1 : quantas deus hisce _Guelferbyt. 4 Heynii, edd. Romana 1475 et Brixiana 1486, Cyllenius_ **24** pr(a)eda ω : poena _D_ : turba _C, Brixianus, ed. min. 1472 (Ov. Met. 3.716 memorat Calonghi)_ : mea _H_ **25** nobis ω : vobis E_1MX_2 * hic ω : hinc _D, Guelferbyt. 1 et 4 Heynii_ * illaque si quis _Bolle_ : illaque si qua est ω, _edd._ : illa qu(a)e si qu(a)e est _H_ : illa si qua est _P_ : illeque si qua _C_ : illaque questa _Courtney (Maia 29 [1987] 30-31)_ : impia si qua est _Voss_ (impia _ex ed. Gryphiana 1573 [i. mg.])_ : iraque si qua est _Huschke, qui in pentametro pro_ ira dei _legebat_ illa dei : illaque si qua _Baehrens, prob. Pichard, def. Watt (Maia 43 [1991] 15-16)_ : illaque sicca _Muretus in comm., qui in vett._ sic qua _inveneral_ **26** sentiat ω : sentiet GOx_1VV_2 (sentiat V_2^2) X_1, _Guelferbyt. 1 et 2 Heynii_ * ira _codd._ : illa _Huschke_ **27** a _edd. recc._ : ah ω : ha $CHIOV_2$, _Datanus_ * temeraria _codd._ : contraria _Cyllenius (cf. 4.83)_ **28** aeri(a)e ω : aere(a)e $DHOx_1V_2$ * et ω : _om._ PTV_2 (et _s. l. add._ V_2^2) :—que Ox_1X_2, _Voss. 1 Heynii_ **29** superest ω : superet _C_ * ne(a)era ω : nehera V_2 : nerea _C_ **30** fata ω : facta _CIP, Askewianus, Brixianus, Eboracensis, Datanus, ed. Romana 1475_ : vota _H_ * tua ω : tibi X_2 * _post v. 30 Herrmann vv. 53-58 posuit_ **31** tempora ω : corpora Ox_1V_2 (tempora _i. mg. add._ V_2^2), _duo Anglic. Heynii_ : pocula _unus Colbertinus Heynii_ **32** multos $CE_1HTV_2^2$ (multas V_2), _Brixianus, Cuiacianus, edd. pr. min. 1472, Aldinae 1502 et 1515, Statius, Broukhusius, Vulpius, Heyne-Wunderlich, De Golbéry, Lachmann, Postgate 1905, Cartault, Pichard, Ponchont, Lenz-Galinsky_ : multas ω, _Askewianus, Datanus, Eboracensis, edd. pr. mai. et Pinelliana 1472, Plantiniana 1569, Cyllenius, Muretus, Passeratius, Voss, Bach, Baehrens, Postgate 1915², Pichard, Tränkle, Lee_ : nimbos _Santen, prob. Luck_ : pluvias _Housman_ * serena ω : secura _C post_ 32 _nov. eleg. inc. ω et edd. vett., cum priore coniunx. ed. Aldina 1515, Muretus, Scaliger et edd. recc._ **33** ei _O_ : hei $CE_1E_2G^2$ _(s. l.)_ $MPOx_2V_2^2$ (h _i. mg. et_ i _s. l._) X_2, _Brixianus, ed. Plantiniana 1569_ : et _f_ : heu _gD, Vincent. Bellov. (Speculum 4.111)_ : si $ABGIOx_1TVX_1$: sic _H_ : e V_2 * mihi _fω_ : quam _g, Vincent. Bellov. l. c._ **34** est ω : et G^2 (s _del., ut vidi)_ * mente iocum ω : corde metum _C_

nec bene mendaci risus componitur ore,
  nec bene sollicitis ebria verba sonant.
Quid queror infelix? turpes discedite curae:
  odit Lenaeus tristia verba pater.
Cnosia, Theseae quondam periuria linguae
  flevisti ignoto sola relicta mari:
sic cecinit pro te doctus, Minoi, Catullus,
  ingrati referens impia facta viri.
Vos ego nunc moneo: felix, quicumque dolore
  alterius disces posse cavere tuum.
Nec vos aut capiant pendentia bracchia collo
  aut fallat blanda sordida lingua fide.
Etsi perque suos fallax iurarit ocellos
  Iunonemque suam perque suam Venerem,
nulla fides inerit: periuria ridet amantum
  Iuppiter et ventos irrita ferre iubet.

---

43 *Vincent. Bellov.* **43b** *fg* **44** *fg, Vincent. Bellov.* **45-46** *g, Vincent. Bellov.* **52** *fυ*

35-36 nec . . . nec *fω* : non . . . non *g, Vincent. Bellov.* **37** queror *ω* : loquor *G, unus Statii* * turpes *ω* : tristes *Askewianus, Datanus* **38** len(a)eus *ω* : laeneus *I, ed. min. 1472* : lerneus E_1 : lentus *C* * *post* **38** *lac. ind. Müller* **39** Cnosia *Kenney (ad Ov. Ars 1.293)* : Gnosia *ω* **40** flevisti ignoto *codd.* : flevit in ignoto *Guyetus, denuo Damsté 208-209 (cf. Ov. Ars 1.525; 3.36)* **41** sic *ω, edd.* : sed Ox_2, *Voss, Heyne-Wunderlich, nuper Tränkle* : haec *malit Broukhusius* : si *dub. Baehrens* **42** facta *ω* : verba *B* **43** vos ego *ω* : vos quoque *T* * nunc *ω* : sic *G, Florentinus Statii* * quicumque *ω* : quocunque *B* : quaecunque *edd. pr. mai. 1472 et Lipsiensis 1500* * dolore *ω* : dolorem E_1HO, *ed. Pineliana 1472* **44** disces *fω* : discis GOx_2, *Brixianus* : didicit *g, Vincent. Bellov. (Speculum 4.28; 5.37)* * cavere tuum *Voss e cod. Falkenburg., denuo coni.* cavere tuom *Baehrens, quem sequuntur Postgate, Pichard, Tescari et Tränkle* : cavere tuos *F, Némethy* : cavere tuo *f, Guyetus cum Guilielmio, Dissen, Herrmann, Lenz-Galinsky, Luck, Lee* : cavere suum *g, Vincent. Bellov. l. c.* : carere tuo *ω, Muretus, Heyne-Wunderlich, De Golbéry, Lachmann* **45** nec vos aut capiant *ω* : ne vos aut capiant *D, susp. Wunderlich* : ne vos decipiant *g, Vincent. Bellov. (Speculum 4.163)* : non vos decipiant *exc. Scaligeri, prob. Guyetus* **46** aut fallat *ω* : nec capiat *g, Vincent. Bellov. l. c., exc. Scaligeri, prob. Guyetus* * sordida *ω* : subdola *Heinsius (Notae in Tib.), cuius auctoritatem Broukhusius et Wunderlich, nuper Müller, Némethy, Pichard et Luck sequuntur* : perfida *Bergk* * fide *ω, Cuiacianus, edd. vett., Cartault, Pichard, Ponchont, Tescari et Lenz-Galinsky* : prece *g, Vincent. Bellov. l. c., Scaliger ex codd., plerique edd. recc. ex Heyne-Wunderlich usque ad Tränkle et Lee* **47** iurarit *Vindobonensis, Dousa et Fruterius ex coni., quos Broukhusius et nuper Herrmann et Tränkle sequuntur* : iurabit *DHT, Brixianus, Colbertinus, unus Passeratii et Heynii, ediderunt De Golbéry, Müller et Luck* : iuravit *ω, plerique edd. vett. et recc.* **49** inerit *ω* : veneri E_2, *Eboracensis (a sec. manu), Guelfetbyt. 1 Heynii, edd. Romana 1475 et Brixiensis 1486* : fuerit *Voss*

Ergo quid totiens fallacis iura puellae
  conqueror? ite a me, seria verba, procul.
Quam vellem tecum longas requiescere noctes
  et tecum longos pervigilare dies,
perfida nec merito nobis nec amica merenti,
  perfida, sed, quamvis perfida, cara tamen!
Naida Bacchus amat: cessas, o lente minister?
  temperet annosum Marcia lympha merum.
Non ego, si fugit nostrae convivia mensae
  ignotum cupiens vana puella torum,
sollicitus repetam tota suspiria nocte:
  tu puer, i, liquidum fortius adde merum.
Iam dudum Syrio madefactus tempora nardo
  debueram sertis implicuisse comas.

---

51 quid DE_2, *edd. Romana 1475, Aldina 1515 et Plantiniana 1569* : qui ω, *Scaliger ex ed. Aldina 1505* * iura *scripsi* : verba ω, *edd.* : dicta *C* : vota *Voss* **52** seria ω : sobria *unus Broukhusii* * procul *Broukhusius ex exc. Pocchi et Italicis Heinsii, quod receperunt De Golbéry, Müller et nuper Luck* : precor *f*ω, *edd. fere omnes* * *post* **52** *in 2 lin. interstitio 'elegia VIII' G (a manu rec.)* **53** vellem ω : mallem E_2, *Zwic. 1 Heynii, edd. pr. mai. 1472 et Vicentina 1481* * tecum longas ω : longas tecum *Askewianus, ed. Aldina 1515, Muretus* **54** longos ω : longas Ox_1V_2 *(corr.* V_2^2*)* : multos Ox_2
55 *om.* V_2 (perfida nec merito nobis inimica merenti *i. mg. add.* V_2^2) * nec amica *Vindobonensis, exc. Pocchi, unus Statii, ed. Veneta 1475, Vicentina et Regiensis 1481, Lipsiensis 1500, Aldina 1515, Heyne-Wunderlich, De Golbéry, Baehrens et Luck* : inimica ω, *plerique edd. vett. et recc.* : mimica *C* : et amica *Postgate dub.* * merenti ω : ferenti *C* : petenti *P* : querenti Ox_2 (merenti *i. mg. add.* Ox_2^2) **56** quamvis perfida ω : quamvis tu mihi *C, exc. Lipsii* **57** naida ω, *edd. pr. min. 1472 et Aldina 1502* : nayda $Ox_2VV_2X_1$: naiada DE_2HT, *edd. pr. mai. et Pineliana 1472, Aldina 1515* : nayada *CP* * amat ω : amas *B* * o ω : io *B* * lente *codd.* : laete *edd. pr. min. 1472 et Aldina 1502* **58** temperet ω, *edd. pr. mai. 1472, Aldinae 1502 et 1515* : temperat BCE_1OP, *Eboracensis, edd. pr. min. et Pinelliana 1472* * marcia *P, Broukhusius ex Wittiano* : martia ω **59** non ego ω : nonne ego *ed. Romana 1475* : non te *CT, unus Statii* * fugit nostrae $AIOV^2$ (e *del.*) V_2^2 (t *del. et* t *corr. ex e*) X_1 : fugiat nostrae DE_1E_2HMP, *edd. pr. mai. 1472, Aldina 1515 et Plantiniana 1569, nonn. edd.* : fugiet nostrae A^2 (e *s. l.*) $BGOx_1Ox_2TVV_2$: nostrae fugiat MX_2, *Brixianus, ed. pr. min. 1472* : nostrae capient *C* : nostrae capiant *unus Statii* **60** vana ω : c(h)ara MX_2E_1 : vacua X_2^2 *(s. l.)* **62** tu puer i *F, Statius ex coni.* : i puer et *Huschke Statium (ad 1.2.1) sec., Luck* : tu puer et ω : tu puer es *T* : tu puer huc *Livineius et Muretus* : huc puer huc *vel* tu puer huic *Heinsius (Notae in Tib.)* * et ω : ast *H* **63** syrio *Askewianus, Vindobonensis, Broukhusius ex nonn. codd. Statii, exc. Lipsii et Heinsii* : syria *Heinsius, quod Voss recepit* : tyrio ω : tyria MTX_2, *Datanus* * madefactus ω : madefactum *C* : madefactas *B* **64** comas ω : caput Ox_1V_2 (comas *i. mg. add.* V_2^2) * *post* **64** *sequuntur nullo intervallo sex versus (= III.18) in* ω *et edd. ante Muretum; tantum tres versus priores in I; non sequuntur in DG*

TRANSLATION INTO SPANISH

I

Las festivas calendas del romano Marte han llegado
—para nuestros tatarabuelos aquí nacía el año—
y ya desparramados por doquier van y vienen en solemnes cortejos,
por las calles y casas de Roma, los regalos.
«Decidme, Piérides, con qué presente agasajar
a Neera, sea mía, o si me engaño, querida con todo».
«Del verso se prendan las hermosas, del dinero las codiciosas».
«Saboree, como merece, ella mis versos».
«Pero que una amarilla funda envuelva el librito color de nieve,
y la pómez afeite con primor sus canas pelusillas,
y una pequeña hoja orle el extremo superior,
de suerte que letras allí escritas indiquen tu nombre,
y estén pintados los cuernos entre las frentes gemelas:
así de engalanada, pues, debes enviar tu obra».
«A vosotras que me habéis inspirado esta poesía os lo pido,
por la sombra de Castalia y los lagos de Pieria,
id a su casa y regaladle este cuidado librito,
tal como quedará: que no se pierda luego ningún color.
Comunicadme si su amor corresponde al mío,
si es menor, o me he desvanecido por completo de su corazón.
Pero, lo primero, obsequiadla, como merece, con un afectuoso saludo
y decidle en voz queda estas palabras:
"Casta Neera, tu antes marido, ahora hermano, te envía
este humilde regalo y ruega lo aceptes;
y jura que tú le eres más querida que sus propias entrañas,
tú, seas en adelante su esposa o su hermana,
pero mejor su esposa: la esperanza de este nombre se la
arrebatará, ya muerto, el agua amarillenta de Dite"».

II

Quien primero su amada a un joven, su amado a una joven
arrebató, de hierro era aquel.
De pedernal también era aquel que pudo soportar tan gran dolor
y seguir viviendo sin su esposa arrebatada.
Yo para esto no tengo entereza; tal capacidad de aguante no va
con mi carácter: que quebranta los fuertes corazones el dolor.
Y no me avergüenza decir la verdad y confesar que,
tras de haber sufrido tantos males, siento hastío de mi vida.
Conque, cuando me haya mudado en ligera sombra
y mis blancos huesos recubra la negra ceniza,
que ante mi pira venga, sus largos cabellos despeinados,
y ante la pira llore, apenada, Neera.
Pero que venga acompañada del duelo de su querida madre:
que llore ésta a su yerno, aquella llore a su esposo.
Tras de invocar a mis manes y rogado a mi alma
y luego de lavar sus piadosas manos con agua,
la parte sola que restará de mi cuerpo, los blancos
huesos, desceñidas recojan en sus negras vestes,
y, reunidos, los asperjen primero con vino añejo,
luego, que se apresten a rociarlos incluso con blanca leche,
después, a enjugar su humedad con velos de lino
y a depositarlos secos en una urna de mármol.
Allí las mercaderías que envían la rica Pancaya,
los Arabes orientales y la rica Asiria,
y lágrimas en mi memoria, allí mismo se viertan:
así quisiera yo ser enterrado, una vez reducido a mis huesos.
Pero que un letrero indique la triste causa de mi muerte
y grabe estos versos en el frontal más visible:
AQUÍ ESTÁ DEPOSITADO LÍGDAMO: SU DOLOR Y PASIÓN POR NEERA,
LA ESPOSA ARREBATADA, FUE LA CAUSA DE SU MERTE.

III

¿De qué vale llenar de votos el cielo, Neera,
y ofrendar incienso propiciatorio, suplicando una y mil veces
no ya poder salir del umbral de una mansión de mármol,
distinguido y admirado por mi esclarecido linaje,
o que mis bueyes renueven un sin fin de yugadas,
y que la tierra me dé, generosa, copiosas cosechas,
sino poder compartir contigo las dichas de una larga vida
y que mi vejez se desplome en tu regazo,
cuando, agotado el tiempo de mi vida y ya muerto,
me vea forzado a ir desnudo en la barca del Olvido?
¿Pues de qué me vale una pesada carga de rico oro
y si hienden mis fértiles campos mil bueyes?
¿O de qué vale una mansión sustentada por columnas frigias,
o tuyas, Ténaro, o tuyas, Caristo,
y los jardines que en las mansiones semejan bosques sagrados
y los artesonados de oro y un suelo de mármol?
¿O de qué la madreperla que se recoge en el litoral de Eritrea
y la lana que tiñe la sidonia púrpura sirven,
y demás cosas que la gente admira? En ellas
anida la envidia: el vulgo codicia equivocado muchísimas cosas.
No con riquezas se sosiegan las mentes angustiadas de los hombres,
pues la Fortuna gobierna las vidas a su antojo.
Séame dichosa a tu lado, Neera, la pobreza;
que sin ti no quiero regios regalos.
¡Luminoso día el que logre devolvérteme!
¡Hora para mi una y mil veces dichosa!
Pero si cuantos votos son formulados por tu dulce retorno,
los escucha un dios no amigo con oído hostil,
ni me complacen reinos, ni el aurífero río de Lidia,
ni cuantas riquezas sustenta la faz de la tierra.
Codicien otros estas cosas; a mí, una vida sencilla junto

a mi querida esposa séame dado poder disfrutar en calma.
Asísteme y secunda mis tímidos votos, Saturnia,
y tú también, Cipria, que viajas en tu concha.
Más si tu vuelta me niegan los hados y las siniestras hermanas,
esas que tejen el hilo y cantan el futuro,
que me llame a los desolados ríos, al negro pantano
y a las aguas estancadas de Dite el pálido Orco.

IV

Los dioses me concedan mejores ensueños y no sean verdaderos
los que, horribles, ayer noche me trajo el sueño.
Idos lejos, vanas visiones, y apartad vuestra falsedad.
Desistid de querer buscar crédito en los vientos.
La verdad profetizan los oráculos divinos, mensajeros del porvenir;
la verdad profetizan las entrañas examinadas por hombres etruscos.
Azarosos ensueños embaucan en la engañadora noche
a los espíritus asustadizos y les infunden falsos temores,
y, nacido para las congojas, el linaje de los hombres los presagios nocturnos
conjura con la harina piadosa y saltarina sal.
Y con todo, como quiera que sea, suelan ellos dar crédito,
bien a un ensueño que presagia verdad, bien a uno embaucador,
que Lucina haga vanos los temores nocturnos
y quiera que un inocente haya albergado temores sin motivo,
si mi mente no es culpable de algún hecho infame
y mi lengua no ha ofendido, impía, a los grandes dioses.
Ya la Noche que atraviesa en su negra cuadriga el etéreo
firmamento había bañado las ruedas en las cerúleas aguas
y no me había dormido el dios benefactor del alma atormentada:
el Sueño deserta ante las casas angustiadas.
Por fin, cuando Febo, al amanecer, tendió su mirada desde el horizonte,
un tardío sueño cerró mis cansados ojos.
En ese momento, un joven, ceñidas sus sienes de casto laurel,
me pareció que ponía pie en mi aposento.

Generación alguna de antepasados ha visto nada más hermoso,
ni tal perfección era cosa humana.
Sus largas melenas se ondulaban por su esbelto cuello,
la cabellera empapada en mirra rezumaba el perfume sirio.
Su resplandor era cual muestra la Latonia Luna,
y el color de su níveo cuerpo sonrosado,
tal como una novia, conducida por primera vez a casa de su oven marido,
tiñe sus tiernas mejillas, sonrojándosele el rostro,
o cuando las muchachas entretejen blancos lirios
con amarantos y en otoño rojean las relucientes manzanas.
La orla de su manto parecía juguetear con sus talones:
pues sobre su resplandeciente cuerpo llevaba tal vestido.
Obra de rara arte, refulgente de carey y oro,
colgaba de su costado izquierdo una cantarina lira.
Tañéndola, al llegar, con un plectro de marfil,
entonó con voz melodiosa alegres canciones.
Pero, después que sus dedos y su voz hubieron cantado al unísono,
pronunció con dulce tono estas tristes palabras:
«Salve, amado de los dioses, pues al poeta piadoso propicios
le amparan Febo, Baco y las Piérides.
Mas el vástago de Sémele, Baco, y las doctas hermanas
no saben decir qué trae la hora siguiente.
A mí, en cambio, las leyes del destino y los acontecimientos
del porvenir mi padre me concedió poderlos vislumbrar.
Por ello, escucha lo que te estoy diciendo yo, profeta no falaz,
y lo que por su boca veraz te va a anunciar el dios del Cinto:
Aquella tan querida para ti, cuanto ni una hija para una madre,
cuanto ni una hermosa muchacha para un galán ardiente,

aquella por quien importunas con tus preces a los poderes celestiales,
la que no deja que tus días transcurran en calma,
y que, cuando el Sueño te ha cubierto con su negro manto,
te engaña con vanas apariciones nocturnas,
la hermosa Neera, celebrada en tus versos,
prefiere ser la amada de otro hombre,
y su mente despiadada abriga inquietudes distintas a las tuyas,
y no entusiasma a Neera el matrimonio en casta casa.
¡Ah, la mujer, sexo cruel y nombre traicionero!
¡Ah, maldita sea la que ha aprendido a engañar al marido!
Pero podría ser doblegada (tienen ellas una mente mudable):
tú sólo tiéndele tus brazos y suplícale con insistencia.
El cruel Amor enseña a arrostrar duras pruebas;
el cruel Amor enseña a saber soportar los azotes.
Yo en otro tiempo apacenté las nevadas terneras de Admeto:
no es leyenda inventada por frívolo pasatiempo.
En aquel entonces no podía yo gozar de la armoniosa cítara,
ni emitir sonidos con mi voz a la par que con las cuerdas,
sino que ensayaba una melodía con una consoladora caña,
yo, el mismísimo hijo de Júpiter y Latona.
No sabes qué es el amor, joven, si rehúsas soportar
una implacable dueña y una unión amorosa cruel.
Ea, pues, no dudes en recurrir a las enternecedoras quejas:
se ablandan con la tierna súplica los duros corazones.
Y si vaticinan la verdad los oráculos en los sagrados templos,
transmítele estas palabras en mi nombre:
"Este matrimonio te lo promete Delio en persona;
feliz con éste: deja de querer otro hombre"».

Dijo, y el sueño abandonó lentamente mi cuerpo.
¡Ah, no pueda yo ver tamaña desgracia!
Ni creería en ti deseos contrarios a mis deseos,
ni que en tu alma cupiese tan gran crimen.
Pues no te engendraron a ti las llanuras del inmenso piélago,
ni la Quimera que vomita fuego por sus fieras fauces,
ni el perro cuyo lomo corona un tropel de serpientes
y tiene tres lenguas y triple cabeza,
o Escila cuyas femeniles curvas ciñe una jauría de perros;
ni te concibió y llevó en su vientre una fiera leona,
ni la bárbara tierra de Escitia o la espantosa Sirte,
sino una casa civilizada y no merecedora de ser habitada por insensibles,
y una madre con mucho la más dulce de todas
y un padre, cual otro más afable que él no hay.
¡Estos crueles sueños un dios los trueque a mejor
y ordene que los templados Notos se los lleven baldíos!

V

Os retiene el agua que mana de las fuentes etruscas,
agua imposible de visitar bajo la Canícula estival,
pero tan apreciable como las sagradas linfas de Bayas,
ahora que con la purpúrea primavera la tierra se reblandece.
A mí, en cambio, Perséfone me anuncia la hora fatal:
no hagas daño, diosa, a un joven sin culpa.
Yo no he tratado de revelar, osado, los ritos de la venerable diosa,
que no debe profanar hombre alguno;
ni mi diestra ha emponzoñado copas con mortíferos brebajes,
ni a nadie ha dado venenos majados;
ni, sacrílego, he pegado fuego a los templos,
ni me remuerden la conciencia actos infames,
ni, maquinando querellas propias de una mente enloquecida,
he desatado mi lengua impía contra dioses hostiles;
y aún las canas no han afeado mis negros cabellos,
ni me ha llegado la encorvada vejez con su lento caminar.
Mi cumpleaños lo celebraron mis padres por primera vez,
el día que cayeron ambos cónsules con pareja fortuna.
¿Qué aprovecha despojar de uvas a la viña cuando están creciendo,
y arrancar los frutos recién salidos con dañina mano?
Piedad, dioses todos que habitáis las pálidas aguas
y obtuvisteis en suerte los reinos inhóspitos, el tercer lote.
Séame dado en otra ocasión conocer los campos Elíseos,
la barca del Olvido y los lagos cimerios,
cuando mi rostro palidezca en la vejez cargada de arrugas
y cuente ya viejo a los críos los tiempos pasados.
Y ojalá me estuviera abrasando una fiebre imaginaria,
pero mi cuerpo hace ya quince días que yace enfermo.
Vosotros, en cambio, veneráis los númenes del manantial etrusco,

e impulsáis con flexibles brazos la dócil agua.
Vivid felices y vivid acordándoos de mí,
tanto si sobrevivo, como si es voluntad de los hados que fallezca.
Entretanto, prometed a Plutón negras reses
y copas de blanca leche junto con vino.

VI

Resplandeciente Líber, ven—sea para ti por siempre la rústica vid,
por siempre lleves ceñidas de hiedra tus sienes—
y llévate tú mi dolor con la pátera medicinal:
muchas veces cayó Amor, vencido por tu don.
Chiquillo, que rebosen las copas de buen vino.
¡Vamos!, escáncianos Falerno en abundancia.
Lejos de aquí las cuitas, cruel ralea, lejos las congojas.
Resplandezca este día con los mejores augurios.
Vosotros, mis buenos amigos, ea, secundad mi propósito,
y que nadie rechace ser soldado, conmigo de capitán;
pero si alguno rehúsa el dulce combate del vino,
que su amada le traicione con oculto engaño.
El uno enriquece los espíritus, el otro dios al altanero
abate y lo somete al capricho de una dueña.
El uno las tigres Armenias y las rojizas leonas
amansó y a los indómitos dio corazones tiernos.
Estas cosas y más grandes puede Amor. Pero pedid los dones
de Baco: ¿a quién de vosotros gustan las copas secas?
Acude benévolo y no fiero Líber para aquellos
que adoran su divinidad a la par que sus jubilosos vinos.
Acude encolerizado sobremanera y altivo para los sobrios;
quien tema el enorme poderío de su cólera, que beba.
Con qué castigos les amenaza, cuál y cuán poderoso,
la presa cruenta de la madre cadmea bien lo advierte.
Pero lejos de nosotros este temor, y ella, y nadie más,
sienta de qué es capaz la cólera del dios ofendido.
¿Qué pido, ay, insensato? Que los vientos y las nubes etéreas
se lleven estos temerarios votos hasta despedazarlos.
Aunque no te quede ningún cariño por mí, Neera,
que seas feliz y sean radiantes tus hados.
Pero nosotros devolvamos su ocasión al desenfadado banquete:
llega, después de muchos, un día sereno.

¡Ay de mí! difícil es simular falsa alegría,
   difícil es fingir buen humor con el corazón triste,
y mal se esboza la sonrisa en un semblante forzado,
   y mal suenan las palabras achispadas en boca de los afligidos.
¿De qué me quejo, infeliz? Apartaos, infames congojas:
   El padre Leneo detesta las palabras tristes.
Tú, Gnosia, en otro tiempo los perjurios de la lengua de Teseo
lloraste a un mar desconocido, sola y abandonada.
Así lo cantó por ti, hija de Minos, el docto Catulo,
   relatando los actos impíos de tu desagradecido esposo.
Ahora yo os advierto: feliz tú, quienquiera que en el dolor
   ajeno aprendas a poder precaver el tuyo propio.
Que ni os seduzcan los brazos colgados del cuello,
   ni os engañe con melifluo juramento una sucia lengua.
Aunque la embustera haya jurado por sus mismísimos ojos,
   por su Juno y por su Venus,
no merece crédito: Júpiter se ríe de los perjurios de los
enamorados y ordena a los vientos que los barran baldíos.
¿A qué me quejo, pues, tantas veces de la tiranía de una
   muchacha embustera? Lejos de mí, palabras serias.
¡Cuánto desearía contigo dormir largas noches
   y contigo velar largos días,
pérfida sin merecerlo conmigo, cariñosa con quien no lo merece,
   pérfida, pero, aunque pérfida, querida con todo!.
Baco ama a la Náyade: ¿te paras, copero holgazán?
   que el agua Marcia temple el vino añejo.
Yo no, si rehuye el convite de mi mesa,
anhelando un lecho desconocido, una muchacha casquivana,
atormentado exhalaré suspiros toda la noche.
   Tú, niño, ea, añade más vino puro.
Ya hace mucho que debía haber humedecido mis sienes
   con nardo sirio y ceñido mis cabellos con guirnaldas.

COMMENTARY

I

A true prologue-poem—dedicatory and programmatic at the same time—this elegy opens the whole Lygdamean cycle, presenting the poems together as a single gift-book. This elegy not only names the addressee of this poetic gift, the beloved (Neaera), it also announces the content (erotic) and tone (plaintive) of its verses and, in the view of some critics, its style as well (neoteric).

The form chosen is that of a fictitious dialogue between the poet and the Muses. The structure is quite simple: A) On the occasion of the *Matronalia*—the chronological setting-Lygdamus consults the Muses on what gift he should offer his beloved Neaera (1–6); the Muses answer with a vague reply that recalls the responses of the oracles (7), from which the poet draws the conclusion that he should honour her with the gift of his poetry (8); B) The Muses advise him to send his poems in a de luxe edition (9–14); C) The poet asks the Muses to act as messengers on his behalf, taking his luxury gift-volume to Neaera (15–20) and passing on his message of unswerving fidelity (21–28). A) is the *causa scribendi*, B) the physical description of the gift-book, C) the description of its content (*fides et spes coniugii*), which is the message of his work.

Precursors of the dedicatory and programmatic prologue-poem are Catul. 1; Prop. 3.1; Ov. *Tr.* 1.1. For the sending of a book of poetry as a gift to mark a festival there is a precedent in Catul. 14, in this case on the occasion of the *Saturnalia*. Further testimony of this practice of giving books as presents can be found in Martial (cf. 14.183–196).

The structuring of the poem as a dialogue with no scenic parentheses or introductory formulas constitutes a unique case in Roman love elegy. However, this dialogue form had already fulfilled a certain function since the early 3rd c. BC in Hellenistic Greek epigram (certain epigrams in the *Anth. Pal.* are short love scenes in dialogue form; cf. 5.46 [Philodemus]; 5.101; 12.155; cf. also G. Pasquali, *Orazio lirico*, pp. 408 ff.), and its roots might even date back to archaic lyric poetry, to judge by some extant fragments of Sappho (cf. 114, 137 and 140a L.-P.). In Roman literature, the earliest examples of this type of dialogue structure are provided by:

A) Hor. *Od.* 3.9, the poet's only ode in dialogue form, although it is strictly an "amoebaean" song, a familiar procedure in Lesbian lyric poetry, where it was used in the epithalamium to contrast two different points of view on matrimony, the man's and the woman's (cf. Sapph. 104 L.-P.; Catul. 62). Horace maintains the opposition between the sexes, though outside the ambit of marriage: the poet has broken off with Lydia; both sing the praises of their new loves (Chloe and Calais), but as they do so they feel the flame of their old love burn anew. Some critics see in Hor. *Od.* 1.28 another ode structured as a dialogue; others, however, consider it a monologue.
B) In Catul. 67 we are witness to a dialogue between the poet and a door accused of disloyalty to its new master.
C) The satires of Horace and Persius contain several well-developed dialogues on different subjects.
D) Ovid closes his *Fasti* with a *dialogus cum Musis*. Like Lygdamus, he beseeches the Muses with the Homeric formula *Dicite Pierides*, and Clio replies as spokeswoman for the *doctae sorores* (6.799–811). The short dialogue presents a scenic parenthesis (*sic ego; sic Clio*, l. 801).
E) The epigrams of Martial offer several examples of *dialogi cum Musis* (3.20; 8.3). Mart. 3.20 is little more than an incipient dialogue: the poet asks the Muse to tell him what his friend *Canius Rufus* is doing, and hazards some guesses as to the possible answer. In the end the Muse herself replies: *vis scire quid agat Canius tuus? ridet.* If this epigram could well have suggested to Lygdamus the basic form of his elegy (dialogue with the Muses but with no scenic parentheses), Mart. 8.3 (which does contain such a parenthesis), in which the poet asks the Muse Thalia for advice and she recommends that he continue composing poetry, might have provided him with the model for the invocation to the Muses as counsellors.

But the influence of Martial does not end here, since the 2nd half of Lygd. 1 (ll. 15 ff.) cannot be understood without reference to another two of his epigrams: 1) in Mart. 10.20[19] (apostrophe without dialogue): Martial entrusts the Muse Thalia with the task of delivering to Pliny the Younger some books of his epigrams, tells her the way to his house and warns her not to knock on Pliny's door at the wrong time, that is, when he is busy working on his speeches. 2) in Mart. 12.11 (apostrophe without dialogue) the poet requests the Muse to bear greetings to his friend Parthenius, and to ask him to deliver

his poems to the Emperor, together with his personal recommendation (Martial even transmits through her the exact phrase his friend is to use when doing so). It was no doubt from Martial that Lygdamus found the inspiration for his Muses as messengers whom he orders to take a gift-book to Neaera and to whom he gives advice on how they should go about it.

Prior to Martial, a poet sending a book never addressed the Muses, but the book itself. The poet's apostrophe to his own book, giving it precise instructions, is first found in Roman literature in Catul. 35 (*Poetae tenero meo sodali, / velim Caecilio, papyre, dicas Veronam veniat*...), although this poetic device ultimately goes back to Hellenistic poetry, or even earlier (cf. Pi. *Nem.* 5). After Catullus, Horace in *Ep.* 1.20 addresses his book as if it were a young slave longing to escape to the big city, and ignoring his master's advice that he should stay at home. Ovid makes use of the same poetic device in his poems from exile (cf. *Tr.* 1.1, *Parve, nec invideo, sine me, liber, ibis in urbem*...; *Ponto* 4.5). In Martial the address to the book is a motif that recurs with particular frequency: 1.3 (with Howell 110; see the introduction by Citroni); 70: Martial orders his book to go to the house of Proculus to carry out the morning *salutatio*, and gives him directions, as well as instructions on how to behave; the same theme is to be found in 1.108; 2.1; 3.2; 4; 5; 4.86; 89; 7.84; 97; 8.1; 72; 9.99; 10.104; 11.1 (with Kay 52); 12.2; Stat. *Silv.* 4.4; cf. also *AP* 12.208 (Straton), Εὐτυχές, οὐ φθονέω, βιβλίδιον.... For the topos, see S. Besslich in *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Buches: Festschrift für Hans Widmann* (1974) 1–12. Martial in 10.20(19) adapts the theme to the Muse Thalia.

Lygdamus goes one step further, uniting in one poem the various burlesque treatments given by Martial to the Muses as sources of inspiration (3.20), as counsellors (8.3) and as simple messengers (10.20[19]). The only literary precedent for this peculiar treatment of the Muses, unparalleled in elegy, lies in the parodic and burlesque treatment meted out in satire (Hor. *Sat.* 1.5.51–54; Juv. 4.34) to the Homeric-style formula of *dicite Pierides* (and similar), with which the Roman epic poets traditionally beg for divine inspiration. This might well have suggested to Martial a broader treatment of the subject. In fact, the same formula is found in Mart. 3.20.1, *Dic, Musa*, and later in Lygd. 1.5, *Dicite Pierides* (cf. comm. *ad loc.*), but used humorously in the former, in accordance with the genre, and inappropriately in Lygdamus, since it is never used in elegy (in Ovid, only in the *Fasti* [2.269; 6.799]). The use of the formula by Lygdamus can only be

attributed to the influence of Martial and his peculiar treatment of the Muses on this prologue-elegy.

Lygdamus has therefore contaminated the motif of the address to a book, which is asked to relay a message, with the motif of the invocation to the Muses requesting poetic inspiration. In short, Lygdamus' treatment of the Muses cannot be understood without reference to Martial.

* * *

1–4: an allusion to the *Matronalia*, a Roman festival held annually on March 1st, the anniversary of the founding of the temple built on the Esquiline in 375 BC in honour of Juno Lucina, the goddess who protects women in labour (cf. Ov. *Fasti* 3.245–248; *Fasti Praen.*; Paul. *Fest.* 147 M.; Schol. Juv. 9.53). A different aetiological tradition, however, holds that this festivity was introduced by Romulus in honour of married women (*matronae*), in order to commemorate the peace which the Sabine women established between their Roman husbands and their Sabine fathers (cf. Ov. *Fasti* 3.229–231; Plu. *Rom.* 21.1). Legendary origins aside, there is no doubt that on this day it was the custom for Roman women to receive a gift from their husbands, as on their birthday (cf. Suet. *Vesp.* 19; Tert. *Idol.* 14; Pompon.-Sex. *Dig.* 24.1.31.8, *si vir uxori munus immodicum Kalendis Martiis aut natali die dedisset, donatio est*). The still clearly matrimonial nature of this festivity at the end of the 1st c. BC is well attested by Hor. *Od.* 3.8.1, *Martiis caelebs quid agam Kalendiis*. A later, indirect testimony may even be deduced from Ov. *Ars* 1.405–408: among the ill-starred days for amorous conquest Ovid lists birthdays, April 1st (festival of Venus) and the day of the *Saturnalia*, because one must start the day by making a gift; however, he does not mention March 1st, which perhaps makes it reasonable to conclude that this had not yet become an occasion for men to give presents to their lovers. However, in time the practice of giving presents at this time extended to the female sex in general (*uxores et puellae amatae*), March 1st becoming in effect a real female *Saturnalia*, an evolution which had already taken place, according to the evidence, at least by the time of Vespasian (cf. Suet. *Vesp.* 19.1; Mart. 5.84.10–12; 9.90.15, where the *Matronalia*-Venus connection—instead of *Matronalia*-Juno-indicates the change that has occurred; Juv. 9.53; Tert. *Idol.* 14.6). Strikingly similar because

of its allusion to the festival of the *Matronalia* is [Tib.] 3.8 [= 4.2]. As in Lygdamus, the mention of the date comes in the first line, and the Kalends are identified by directly naming Mars (*Sulpicia est tibi culta tuis, Mars magne, Kalendis*); moreover, after listing luxurious *munera* (ll. 15–20), Cerinthus—in an apostrophe to the Muses—also opts for the gift of poetry (ll. 21–24), which, as in Lygdamus, could well be the cycle of poems that follows. There are also several lexical agreements (cf. Lygd. 1.8 *digna est* ≈ [Tib.] 3.8.15 *digna est* and 24 *dignior est*; Lygd. 1.1 *festae . . . kalendae* ≈ [Tib.] 3.8.21 *festis . . . kalendis*). The whole Lygdamus passage is unusually high-flown and solemn for elegy; besides, even the preponderance of spondees in the hexam-etrical rhythm (in particular the opening holospondaic hexameter) contributes to reinforcing the ceremonial tone of the passage.

On the *Matronalia*, see Marquardt-Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsverw.* 3.571; Latte, "Lucina", *RE* 13.2 (1927) 1648–1651; S. Weinstock, "Matronalia", *RE* 14.2 (1930) 2306–2309; Daremberg-Saglio III.1 s.v. *Iuno* p. 684^{b}; *ThLL* 8.490.16–26.

1 Martis Romani festae venere Kalendae: for the formulation of the line, note the striking resemblance to Hor. *Sat.* 1.3.87, *cum tristes misero venere Kalendae/*, in which Horace alludes to the Kalends as an ill-starred day when debts or the payment of interest on loans were normally due in Rome (for this meaning of *Kalendae*, cf. also Afran. 163, *Septembris heri Kalendae, hodie ater die*; Cic. *Amer.* 57; Hor. *Epod.* 2.70; Ov. *Rem.* 561–562, *celeres . . . Kalendas*; Mart. 8.44.11; *ThLL* VII 757.38–44, under the heading *Kalendis aera solvenda sunt*). Lygdamus makes use of what must have been the normal formula among defaulters to refer to the most feared day of the month (*tristes Kalendae veniunt!*) in order to refer on the contrary to a festivity (*festae* replacing *tristes*), though one demanding equal respect. The fact that the end of the hexameter coincides in the two authors (*venere Kalendae/*) is not a matter of chance: either Lygdamus is deliberately imitating Horace, or both are making use of a popular idiom.

Martis . . . Kalendae: the *Martiae Kalendae* (March 1st) were dedicated to the god of that month, Mars. The connection between warmongering Mars and the Roman *matronae* had seemed strange to Ovid himself (cf. *Fasti* 3.167 ff.). Perhaps the reason is to be found in the fact that, since March is the month when Spring begins, the first of the month also marks the beginning of germination and recovered vitality in the countryside, a fact which could easily have been assimilated both to feminine fecundity and the resuming of military campaigns with the arrival of the good weather. For the poetic

construction *Martis . . . Kalendae*, cf. Ov. *Fasti* 3.135–136, *neu dubites primae fuerint quin ante Kalendae / Martis*; Mart. 9.90.15, *sic Martis tibi* (scil. *Veneri*) *serviant Kalendae*. However, the usual way to indicate the month was to use its name in the genitive, or else the corresponding adjective in agreement (*Kalendae Martiae* or *Martii*), not the name of the eponymous deity to whom the month was dedicated (cf. *ThLL* 7.2.756.76 ff.).

Martis Romani: the adjective *Romanus* applied to Mars emphasises that he was father of Romulus and, correspondingly, of the Roman people.

festae . . . Kalendae: the same phrase is found in [Tib.] 3.8 [= 4.2].21, *hanc vos, Pierides, festis cantate Kalendis*.

venere: the use in poetry of the forms in *-ērūnt* or *-ērĕ* of the 3rd pers. pl. of the perfect indicative corresponds in principle to mere metrical convenience. As regards the elegiac genre, the greater frequency of the older form in *-ere* is obvious, given its easier adaptation to dactylic verse. According to statistics by Smith (178 *ad* Tib. 1.5.47), in genuine Tibullus there are 8 occurrences of forms in *-ere* as opposed to 4 in *-erunt* (*amarunt* in 2.3.69); in Lygdamus the only forms to be found are those in *-ere* (1.1; 5.15 *laesere*; 5.17 *videre*; *norunt* in 4.46). In addition to its metrical advantages, the older form in *-ere* had the added benefit of its unmistakable archaic flavour, which was particularly appropriate for elevated epic style (cf. Williams 152–153 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 5.580; Austin 49 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 2.53; Barratt 41 *ad* Luc. *Civ.* 5.113–114): in the *Aeneid* 231 forms in *-ere* are found, as against 29 in *-erunt*. Cicero (*Or.* 157) speaks of the pleasant sound of *scripsere*, but adds: *scripserunt esse verius sentio* (cf. Quint. *Inst.* 1.5.43). Outside epic and the elegiac distich, in which their preponderance is favoured by their archaic tone and metrical considerations, the use of perfect forms in *-ere* is noticeably less frequent: in writers of hexametrical verse like Horace and Juvenal, forms in *-erunt* are proportionally much more common; among prose-writers, Cicero and Caesar seldom use *-ere* (cf. Nisbet *ad* Cic. *Pis.* 96; Klotz *ad* Caes. *Civ.* 1.51.5), and Livy does so more frequently in his early books than in the later ones, no doubt as a result of the influence of epic and the archaic tone; for the same reason Tacitus mainly uses perfects in *-ere* in the *Annales* and *Historiae*, but never in his 'Ciceronian' *Dialogus de oratoribus*. On the forms in *-ere*, see Neue-Wagener III^3 190 ff.; H. Hagendahl, *Die Perfektformen auf -ēre und ērūnt*, Uppsala, 1923; C. F. Bauer, *The Latin Perfect Endings '-ere' and '-erunt'*, Language Dissertations, Philadelphia, 1933; Marouzeau II 84–85; R. B. Steele,

"The Endings '-ere' and 'erunt' in Dactylic Hexameter", *AJPh* 32 (1911) 328–333; E. Löfstedt, *Per. Aeth.*, Uppsala, 1936 (= 1911), pp. 36 ff.; *Syntactica* II, pp. 295 ff.; Marouzeau, *Stylistique*, pp. 125–126; Hofmann-Szantyr 404 (§ 214 c); 720 (Stilistik § 15 III E).

Kalendae: (from *calo* < κάλω: to announce the beginning of a new lunar phase) was the name given to the phase of new moon (*novilunium*) in the three-part division of the old lunar month (*Nonae* = fourth crescent; *Idus* = full moon); for the etymology, cf. Varro *Lat.* 6.27; Macr. *Sat.* 1.15.5; 9 ff.; Serv. *Aen.* 8.654; Ernout-Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine* (Paris 1959–1960) s.v. *Kalendae*; Walde-Hofmann, *LEW* I, 136–137. The Kalends were the first day of each month, even when the Julian solar calendar had come into force (44 AD); on this date the Pontifex Maximus would publicly announce whether the nones were to be in five or seven days' time, which days of the month were to be considered *fasti* and which *nefasti*, as well as the holidays and commemorations to be observed in the new month.

2 exoriens nostris hinc fuit annus avis: in the primitive Romulean calendar of ten lunar months, the first of March was New Year's Day, the *primus nascentis anni dies* (cf. Ov. *Fasti* 1.27 ff. [with Frazer]; Nilsson, *op. infra cit.*, p. 223); it continued to be so even after the eventual addition of *Ianuarius* and *Februarius*, a reform attributed to the legendary king Numa Pompilius (cf. Ov. *Fasti* 1.43–44; 3.151–152; Cens. 20.4), until in the year 153 BC the ceremony in which the consuls took up office—and which marked the beginning of the Roman 'civil year'—was moved to January 1st (cf. Cassiod. *Chronica Minora* ed. Mommsen, II 130, *MGH*, n° 408, a.u.c. 601 = 153 BC, *Q. Fulvius et T. Annius. Hi primi conss. kal. Ianuariis magistratum inierunt propter subitum Celtiberiae bellum*). The names of the months *Quintilis*, *Sextilis*, *September*, *October*, *November* and *December* clearly reveal the old arrangement of the Roman calendar; cf. Atta *Tog.* 18 ff. R, *annum novum voluerunt esse primum mensem Martium . . . maiores Martium primum habuerunt*; Varr. *Lat.* 6.33, *mensium nomina sunt aperta fere, si a Martio, ut antiqui instituerunt, numeres*; Serv. *Ge.* 1.43, *inter mensem Februarium, qui tunc esset extremus, et inter Kalendas Martias, quae tunc erant primae*; Ov. *Fasti* 3.73 ff., 135–150; Fest. 150 M. However, there is evidence of the new year beginning on different Kalends; cf. Liv. 3.6.1, *creati consules L. Aebutius, P. Servilius, Kalendis Sextilibus, ut tunc principium anni agebatur, consulatum ineunt.* To correct the differences between the lunar year, now lasting twelve months, and the solar year, Julius

Caesar in the year 47 BC, using the powers conferred on him as Pontifex Maximus and in collaboration with the astronomer Sosigenes of Alexandria—as we know from Plin. *Nat.* 18.211—established for the future an official year of 365 days, with the need to add one more day to February every four years (the leap year) to make up for the chronological difference with respect to the solar year of 365¼ days. The 'Julian reform' remained in force until 1582, when Pope Gregory XIII promoted a further reform known as the 'Gregorian', in which the leap years are clearly pre-established.

On the Roman calendar, see Th. Mommsen, *Die Römische Chronologie bis auf Caesar*, Berlin 1859; Ph. E. Huschke, *Das alte Römische Jahr und seine Tage*, Wiesbaden 1869 (repr. 1970); M. P. Nilsson, *Primitive Time-Reckoning*, Lund 1920; E. Bickermann, *Chronology of the Ancient World*, 1968; *id.*, "Zur Frage von dem Alter des vorcäsarischen Kalenders", *Strena philologica Upsaliensis*, 1922; F. Altheim, *History of Roman Religion* (1938) 104 ff.; H. J. Rose, "The Prae-Caesarian Calendar, *CJ* 40 (1944–1946) 65–75; A. Kirsopp Michels, "The 'Calendar of Numa' and the Prae-Julian Calendar", *TAPhA* 80 (1949) 320–346; *id.*, *The Calendar of the Roman Republic*, Princeton 1967; A. Ruiz de Elvira, "Problemas del calendario romano", *CFC* 11 (1976) 9–17.

exoriens . . . annus: a combination modelled on a use strictly applicable to *dies* (cf. *ThLL* 2.1573.63 ff.), which only reappears—as a conscious echo, suspects Tränkle 67—in Isid. *Nat.* 4.2, *a Martio, quia ex ipso anni exorientis ordinem servaverunt antiqui. Exoriens* is used here as a participle with abstract verbal force like "*ab Vrbe condita*": "the birthday of the year", an alternative poetic formula to the prosaic *principium* (or *initium*) *anni* of the historiographers (cf. Liv. 2.48.2; 52.6; 3.6.2; Tac. *Ann.* 13.10; *ThLL* 2.116.20–32). The whole of l. 2 constitutes a learned *excursus* (or *digressio*), a good example of Lygdamus' inquisitive interest in the past.

nostris // . . . avis: pentameter with internal rhyme, that is, the last word of the first hemistich rhymes with the last word of the second (homoeoteleuton). Around 20 to 25% of the pentameters of all the elegiac poets display this internal rhyme (Catul. 22%; Tib. 21%; Prop. I 27%; Lygd. 21%), which according to Owen (*ad* Ov. *Tr.* 2.104) is deliberate, an opinion not shared by Platnauer (*Latin Elegiac Verse*, p. 49), while B. Wohl adopts an eclectic approach (*art. infra cit.*, p. 411): "In many cases it [= the desire for parallel construction in the two halves of the pentameter] creates a kind of syntactical rhyme or homeoteleuton, although it is impossible to tell to

what extent this was in fact an intended effect or often simply produced by the nature of Latin declensions". In Lygdamus the phenomenon occurs in 26 of the 145 pentameters, which is a slightly lower proportion (18%) than in the Augustan elegists: 1.2; 10; 22; 2.8; 12; 14; 3.14; 26; 34; 36; 38; 4.6; 16; 32; 38; 52; 68; 80; 96; 5.8; 14; 22; 6.12; 26; 58; 62. It is noteworthy that in 23 of the 26 cases there is an adjective-noun syntagma (only in Lygd. 3.34 is the reverse order of noun-adjective found); in 3 there are clear parallelisms (Lygd. 2.14 *genero // ... viro*; 3.14 *tuis // ... tuis*; 36 *ducunt // ... canunt*; only in one case does the adjective before the caesura in the 3rd foot not qualify the noun closing the pentameter (Lygd. 4.38, *pendebat laeva // garrula parte lyra*). The statistics for Lygdamus are therefore consistent with the clear tendency in Latin elegy to place an adjective before the main caesura in the hexameter or pentameter of the elegiac distich, and the noun qualified by this adjective at the end of the line; this tendency logically favoured internal rhyme in the pentameter; cf. C. Conrad, "Traditional Patterns of Word-Order in Latin Epic from Ennius to Vergil", *HSCP* 69 (1965) 195–258; B. Wohl, "The Phenomenon of *Sperrung* in Tibullus' Elegies", *TAPhA* 104 (1974) 385–428; on rhyme, see E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa* (Leipzig 1898, repr. Darmstadt 1958) 810–908; N. Herescu, *La Poésie Latine* (Paris 1960) 135 ff.; L. P. Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry* (Cambridge 1963) 25–34; on homoeoteleuton, see Lausberg §§ 725–728.

hinc: although most of the mss. give the reading *hic*, the variant *hinc* is nevertheless convincing, present as it is in some of the *recentiores* (*Bernensis, Caesaraugustanus, Cuiacianus*) and accepted by no small number of editors from Scaliger to Luck. Broukhusius backed it up with Ov. *Fasti* 3.145, *nec mihi parva fides, annos* ***hinc*** *isse priores*; I would also add Ov. *Fasti* 3.75, ***a te*** [scil. *Marte*] *principium Romano dicimus anno*. This striking coincidence between Lygdamus and Ovid's *Fasti* was pointed out by G. Baligan ("Il terzo libro del *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Studi pubblicati dall'Ist. di Filol. Class. della Univ. di Bologna* I (1948) 25; "Ancora su Ligdamo", *Aevum* 24 (1950) 291 n. 1).

avis: not in the strict sense of "grandfathers" here, but in the wider and more poetic sense of "forebears", "ancestors". This sense occurs mainly in poetry, especially in the higher genres; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 7.56, *Turnus, avis atavisque potens*; 220; 10.201; 12.164; Tib. 1.1.42, *antiquo ... avo*; 10.18, *veteris ... avi*; 2.1.2, *prisco ... avo* (with Murgatroyd 23); Prop. 2.34.56; 4.11.30; Ov. *Her.* 15.176; Stat. *Theb.* 5.670; Val.-Flac. 6.518; *OLD avus* 2; *ThLL* 2.1611.73 ff.; É. Évrard, "Vieux

et ancien chez Tibulle", *Latomus* 37 (1978) 142–144. On the connotations of this peculiar poetic use of *avus*, Évrard himself states (*ibid.*, p. 144): "Quelque que soit sa valeur dénotative, ce mot [*avus*] se trouve toujours dans conditions telles qu'il s'enrichit de résonances de glorie, de grandeur, de solennité".

3–4: convoluted distich which expressively transmits the festive atmosphere of the day of the *Matronalia*: the immediacy (*nunc*), haste (*discurrunt*), bustle and disorder (*vaga*, ***dis****-currunt*, *undique*, *perque vias Vrbis . . . perque domos*) characteristic of festivities, all underpinned by the strange and capricious collocation of the words. But this sensation of a festive *totum revolutum* faithfully reflects a timeless tradition and is therefore developed in accordance with a precise ritual and one that is in no way improvised; the deliberate *vaga/certa* opposition—which would be lost with the conjecture *crebra* (Luck)—emphasises this contrast effectively. Besides, the point of *certa* is that in the midst of the apparent confusion, each party is aiming for a particular target ('ad certum finem'). The content of the pentameter suggests a *Matronalia* now opened up to women in general (cf. comm. on ll. 1–4): *perque domos* refers to the gifts to wives, *perque vias* to lovers, since in the latter case the presents would have to be sent to their own homes.

discurrunt . . . perque . . . perque: for *per* with *discurrere*, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 12.589–590, *illae* (= *apes*) *intus trepidae rerum per cerea castra discurrunt*; Ov. *Met.* 14.418–419, *famuli populusque per omnes / discurrunt silvas* (with Bömer 139).

discurrunt . . . munera: for the expression, cf. Tert. *Idol.* 14.6, *munera commeant et strenae* (also in connection with the *Matronalia*).

3 vaga . . . discurrunt: for the phrase, cf. Mart. 4.78.3, *discurris tota vagus urbe*; 8.33.15, *nec vaga tam tenui discurrit aranea tela*; Fletcher 49.

pompa: according to Tränkle 67, *pompa* is here the line of processional floats on which the gifts are transported, as in Mart. 12.32.25, *haec sarcinarum pompa convenit ponti.* Némethy 32 gives a more precise definition: «*pompa* autem dicitur de servis munera portantibus et de donorum ipsorum multitudine»; cf. Pl. *ap.* Macr. *Sat.* 2.12, *quis est mortalis tanta fortuna adfectur unquam, / quam ego nunc sum, quoius haec ventri portatur pompa* (scil. *cibi multi et varii*).

4 perque vias . . . perque domos: a high-flown formula with a decidedly epic flavour which expresses disordered ubiquity in the context of the city; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.364–365, *plurima perque vias sternuntur inertia passim corpora perque domos*, the expression being reinforced by

passim just as it is by *undique* in Lygdamus, except that in the latter the context is dynamic (*discurrunt*), while in Virgil it is static (*sternuntur*). For *perque vias urbis*, cf. Ov. *Fasti* 2.553, *perque vias urbis latosque ululasse per agros*, also in the first hemistich of the pentameter.

-que . . . que: this use of duplicated *-que* is an archaizing feature characteristic of elevated epic style (very common in Virgil, Lucan and Statius), never found in classical prose (*et . . . et*). Its metrical advantages are obvious, especially at the end of the line (very frequent in Ennius, Virgil and Ovid), in imitation of Homeric polysyndeton τε . . . τε (eg *Il.* 1.167, σοὶ τὸ γέρας πολὺ μεῖζον, ἐγὼ δ' ὀλίγον τε φίλον τε); cf. Austin 48 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 4.83 *auditque videtque*; Williams 62 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 5.92; *Trad. & Orig.* 688; Norden 228 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 6.336 *navemque virosque/*; the statistics in Smith 192–193 *ad* Tib. 1.1.33 *furesque lupique*; Murgatroyd 172 *ad* Tib. 1.5.35 *Eurusque Notusque*; Barratt 18 *ad* Luc. *Civ.* 5.48 *patriaeque suumque/*; Hofmann-Szantyr 515 (§ 283 a); Kühner-Stegmann II.2.36; Ernout-Thomas 443–444 (§ 427); Bassols II.97–98 (§ 96.1); for Lygdamus, cf. also 1.16, *Castaliamque umbram Pieriosque lacus* (comm.); 3.26, *terque quaterque*; 4.44, *Phoebusque et Bacchus Pieridesque* (comm.). The epic reduplication of *-que* tends to be used with words which are closely inter-related by sense or category, at times virtually formulas; eg *frangitque quatitque* (Enn. *Ann.* 405 V.); *auditque videtque* (Verg. *Aen.* 4.83); the frequent *itque reditque*; *noctem diemque* (Verg. *Aen.* 5.766); *caelique marisque* (Verg. *Aen.* 5.802); *terra marique* (Verg. *Aen.* 9.492; 10.162; Luc. *Civ.* 5.262); *miseretque pudetque* (Verg. *Aen.* 9.787); cf. H. Christensen, "*Que - que* bei den röm. Hexametrikern (bis etwa 500 n. Chr.)", *ALL* 15 (1908) 164–211; in this connection, cf. Lygd. 3.26, *terque quaterque.*

Vrbis: with initial capital is always the capital of the Empire, Rome.

munera: ie *dona*; cf. 1.24; 3.24; 6.4; *ThLL* 8.1664.35 ff.

5–6: Lygdamus consults the Muses on what sort of present he should give Neaera. Undoubtedly, Lygdamus is here re-using the old epic motif of the invocation to the Muses. The formulation of the hexameter would appear to suggest this.

5 dicite, Pierides: same hexameter-beginning as in Verg. *Ecl.* 8.63; Ov. *Fasti* 2.269; 6.799. The invocation of the Muses as goddesses who will inspire the poet dates back to Homeric epic and hymns (eg *Il.* 1.1); what is more, the Latin formula itself, *dicite, Pierides*, is moulded on the Homeric ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι (*Il.* 2.484; 11.218; 14.508; 16.112) and μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα (*Od.* 1.1). Other Latin variants on this old epic motif can be found in Verg. *Ge.* 4.315, *quid deus hanc,*

Musae, . . .; *Aen.* 7.37, *nunc age, qui reges, Erato* . . .; 641, *pandite nunc Helicona, deae*, . . . (= 10.163–165); [Verg.] *Catal.* 9.2, *pauca mihi doctae dicite Pegasides*; Ov. *Met.* 15.622–623, *pandite nunc, Musae, praesentia numina vatum / . . . / unde* . . . (with Bömer 419–420); *Fasti* 4.193–194, *pandite, mandati memores, Heliconis alumnae, / . . . cur* . . .; Sil. 3.222–223, *prodite, Calliope, famae, quos horrida coepta exciverint populos*; Stat. *Theb.* 10.628–630, *nunc age quis stimulos* . . . *addiderit iuveni* . . . *memor incipe Clio*. For its subsequent ironic and burlesque use in satire and epigram, cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.5.51–54; Juv. 4.34 (with Mayor 223; Courtney 196); Mart. 3.20.1, *Dic, Musa*; 8.3.2. The indirect question with which Lygdamus completes the line is also present in the Homeric model (eg *Il.* 11.218–219, ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια ἔχουσαι, /ὅς τις δὴ πρῶτος . . . For *dicite* at the beginning of the hexameter, cf. also Prop. 3.1.5 and Ov. *Tr.* 3.1.19. See also the introduction to the elegy.

Pierides: epithet given to the Muses for having been born, according to Hes. *Th.* 54, in Pieria (Thrace); however, legend has it that the Muses of Helicon take this name from the daughters of Pieros of Macedonia, the original Pierides, in commemoration of their victory over them in a contest of epic song (cf. Ov. *Met.* 5.294–317; 663–678; Ant. Lib. 9); cf. Grimal, *Mitología*, p. 428; Ruiz de Elvira, *Mitología clásica*, p. 451. The first time these goddesses receive the name Pierides in a poetic context is in Hes. *Sc.* 206, and in Latin literature in Lucr. 4.1, *avia Pieridum* (cf. 1.946, *carmine Pierio*); Varr. *Men.* 467. In the Augustan period most of the examples are from Ovid and Virgil; only once in Horace (*Od.* 4.8.20, *Calabrae Pierides*) and Propertius (2.10.12); four times in Tibullus (1.4.61; 62; 9.48; 3.8 [= 4.2].21 [with n. by Smith 492]); never in epic; five times in Virgil, all in the *Eclogues* (eg 3.85; 6.13; 8.63; 9.33; 10.72); 15 times in Ovid, all but two (*Am.* 1.1.6; *Ars* 3.548) in his poetry from exile (*Fasti* 2.269; 5.109; 6.798; 799; *Tr.* 3.2.3; 4.1.28; 9.16; 5.1.34; 5.3[4].10; *Ponto* 2.5.63; 4.2.45; 8.70; 16.42); note also *Pieris* in *Fasti* 4.222 and *Pieridas* in *Tr.* 3.7.4 and 5.7.32. In the post-Augustan period there is little evidence of the term *Pierides*; cf. Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.67; Mart. 12.68.4, *Pieridumque comes*; Juv. 4.36; Ennod. 1.1.37; Claud. *Carm.* 3.24; *Carm. min.* 31.61; *Append.* 2.1; *PLM* 3.62. In Lygdamus it appears again in 4.44. The Romans also eventually referred to the Muses in the Latinized form *Pieriae* (cf. Cic. *Nat.* 3.54; Ov. *Ponto* 4.12.28), from the adjective *Pierius* which was used to denote anything connected with them, first in Lucr. 1.946, *carmine Pierio*; cf. *infra* l. 16, *Pieriosque lacus*, and [Tib.] 3.7 [= 4.1].192, *Pierii* . . . *honores*.

As divinities of poetic inspiration, the Muses are often associated with Apollo and Dionysus, thus forming the triad of deities of poetry (cf. Lygd. 4.44, *Phoebusque et Bacchus Pieridesque* [comm.]). Although they frequented Mt. Olympus, where their songs brought cheer to the banquets of the immortals and captivated the heart of Zeus, their chosen dwelling was Helicon, a high mountain in Boeotia, where they sang and danced, later cooling themselves in the spring-waters of the Aganippe or Hippocrene. The Muses also lived for some time on Mt. Parnassus, in Phocis, in the company of Apollo Musagetes; on the side of this mountain was a fountain consecrated to them, called Castalia, a source of inspiration to all who drank of its waters. The number of Muses is not fixed, but varies between one and twenty-two, although the classical period firmly establishes the figure of nine, following the Hesiodic canon, and attributes a particular function to each: Calliope (epic poetry), Clio (history), Polyhymnia (the mimic art), Euterpe (the flute), Terpsichore (lyric poetry and dance), Erato (choral lyric), Melpomene (tragedy), Thalia (comedy) and Urania (astronomy). There are no datable myths concerning the Muses before Homer (*Il.* 2.594–600), nor do they have a cycle of legends of their own, which suggests that before the archaic period they were not firmly established as religious deities. Neither did they always have the functions familiar to us, as is observed by Konishi (*infra cit.*, p. 116): "The Muses are quite rightly defined as goddesses of poetry, music and dance . . . However, . . . originally, before the Muses were associated with Greek Lyric, they were a symbol for literacy, and had very little to do with music or dance."

On the image of the Muses in Antiquity and in the classical tradition as the incarnation of all superior forms of spiritual life, see Curtius 324–348; H. Konishi, "Muse, goddess of literacy", *LCM* 18.8 (October 1993) 116–121; on the specific role of these goddesses in Tibullus and Lygdamus, cf. G. Lieberg, "Le Muse in Tibulo e nel *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Prometheus* 6 (1980) 29–55; 138–152 (pp. 138–146 for Lygdamus; p. 147 n. 157 for the Latin use of *Pierides* for "Muses").

donetur honore: for the expression, cf. [Verg.] *Cir.* 269, *quem pater ipse deum sceptri donavit honore/* (with Lyne 215); Liv. 45.22.2, *quos praemiis atque honoribus donastis*; Vell. 2.115.1; Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.140, *donavit honore triumphi.*

honore: here with an equivalent meaning to *munus* or *donum*, but with the added nuance of "gift which honours, reward which distinguishes" (*donum honorificum*); cf. *ThLL* 6.3.2923.9 ff. The combination

of *donetur* (l. 5) and *digna* (l. 7) stresses the fact that *honos* is a special honour or privilege granted voluntarily to someone as a reward for his merits, such as the triumph awarded to generals, the right of foreigners to citizenship, of veterans to land, etc.

6 seu mea . . . cara Nearea tamen: a highly-debated line, on which the commentators can reach no agreement. There are two difficulties: a) is *fallor* to be taken as a middle voice ("I deceive myself") or as a passive ("I am deceived <by Neaera>")?; b) what is the function of *seu . . . seu* in the syntax of the sentence? As regards the latter, there are those who interpret the line in the sense 'vel mea vel, si fallor, tamen cara', with the disjunction applying to both adjectives. The main objection to this interpretation is that it forces the two *seu* to be understood in different senses: *seu*^{1} as a disjunctive conjunction, *seu*^{2} = *vel si*; each by itself is perfectly plausible, but nowhere is there any attested case of the two together. Others, like Tränkle 68–69, correctly take the line to mean: 'sive mea est, sive fallor, pariter cara', where there would only be a slight anacoluthon—ellipsis of *est*?; or subconscious step towards a completely subordinated clause?—and *tamen* would only affect the second conditional. As for *fallor*, support for the passive voice and the amatory sense of the term (cf. comm. *ad loc.*) may be found in Lygd. 4.62, *a pereat, didicit fallere siqua virum!*, but the content would not square with the *casta Neaera* of Lygd. 1.23, although the *perfidia Neaerae* is well attested in Lygd. 4.59–60 and 79–80. Perhaps Lygdamus is playing with a deliberately ambiguous *fallor* here, as Ovid did previously in *Met.* 1.607–608 (cf. M. Paschalis, "*Aut ego fallor aut ego laedor* [Ovid *Metamorphoses* 1.607–608]. A witty tautology?", *Eranos* 84 [1986] 62–63).

Parallel constructions to l. 5 further below are l. 26, *sive sibi coniunx sive futura soror*, and especially Lygd. 6.56, *perfida, sed quamvis perfida, cara tamen.*

mea: scil. *mea puella*. In amatory language *mea* is used of the beloved insofar as she is faithful and the poet is therefore exclusive owner of her love (cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.12.5–6, *quae modo dicta mea est, quam coepi solus amare, cum multis vereor ne sit habenda mihi*; also Pichon, p. 201 s.v. *meus*). In spite of the possessive, it is in fact the love-struck poet who is under the domination of his beloved, in accordance with the elegiac topos of *servitium amoris*.

fallor: in elegiac poetry, *fallere* is not to observe the *fides* promised; cf. Lygd. 4.62; 6.12; 46; 47; 51; Pichon, p. 142 ("*fallere* est . . . promissam violare fidem").

Neaera: Prudentius (348-*circa* 410 AD) uses this proper name as if it were a common noun absolutely equivalent to *pellex* or *meretrix* (cf. *Perist.* 10.239–40; *Sym.* 1.139); that is, by his time *Neaera* had become an offensive label to be applied to any *lasciva mulier*. However, there is no proof of this pejorative connotation for the centuries before Prudentius. In fact, in Greek mythology Neaera is the name of a nymph who bore Helios two daughters, Lampetia and Phaethusa (cf. Hom. *Od.* 12.132 ff.). In the most genuine Roman tradition, with roots going back to strictly Italic beliefs and rituals, there is one Nerio or Neriene, wife of Mars, who after her apotheosis is said to have changed her name to *Neaera*, following established practice (cf. Gell. 13.23.2). In Verg. *Ecl.* 3.3—from where Lygdamus might have taken it—*Neaera* is the name of a shepherdess. What explanation is there, then, for such a radical semantic change from the name of a nymph, goddess or shepherdess to a term of opprobrium? Vulpius justifies it by the following etymology for *Neaera*: "derivatum videtur a νέος et αἴρω, quasi νέος αἴρυσα, iuvenem capiens et auferens". However, the most plausible and generally accepted etymology derives νείαιρα (or νέαιρα), via the suffix form commonly used to denote females, from the root νεαρό- (like χίμαιρα from χίμαρος), giving it the meaning of "young" (f). Postgate ("Neaera as a common name", *CQ* 8 [1914] 121–122) considers that neither this meaning nor the personal conduct of the historical or legendary woman who bore the name of *Neaera* justify its use as a term of abuse to denote a *lasciva femina*, but rather its association with the phrase νείαιρα γαστὴρ (or simply νείαιρα) which means "ventris inferiorem partem" and ἡ γυναικεία ὑστέρα (cf. Eust. *Il.* p. 580.21), following the disparaging synecdoche *cunnus* = *impudica* (cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.36 and 70, where the term *cunnus* is applied to a woman who leads an adulterous life or is not overly concerned about her decency; 3.107, referring to the adulterous Helen of Troy; Mart. 6.45.1, *lascivi nubite cunni*; cf. also Hofmann, *Latín familiar*, p. 127 [§ 82]; Montero Cartelle, *Latín erótico*, p. 32).

tamen/: around 80% of all the pentameters of the three elegiac poets end with a noun or a verb; about 17% with a pronoun, normally possessive; the remaining 3% alone cover adverbs, conjunctions, numerals and adjectives (Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, pp. 40–48). The only examples of this last group in Lygdamus are the adverb *tamen* (twice; cf. also 6.56 [comm.]), the adjective *purpureus* (4.46) and the present participle with adjectival force *sequens* (4.46).

7–8: Lygdamus' question to the Muses about the kind of present he should give Neaera (ll. 5–6) is now answered by the Muses themselves with the typical brief and ambiguous oracle-style response which the gods usually use to answer men who consult them (l. 7): "poetry seduces fair women, money the covetous". The conclusion is to be drawn by the person who consulted them (Lygdamus), in whose view the interpretation of the oracle (l. 8) is: "let her delight in my poetry, as is her merit." This is certainly an elegant compliment to Neaera, who is thus praised, in effect, as *formosa et non avara.* (The same link between beauty and poetry is taken up again by Lygdamus in 3.4.57, *carminibus celebrata tuis formosa Neaera*). Traditionally, however, since Muretus this distich has been attributed in its entirety to the Muses, in the understanding that it forms, together with the following three distichs (ll. 9–14), the complete response of the goddesses to Lygdamus (ll. 7–14). To do this, it was necessary to break with the unanimous manuscript tradition, given that *meis* (l. 8) and *tuum* (l. 12) are incompatible: «*versibus illa tuis*] ita legendum est, non, ut antea, *meis*. Musae enim ipsae loquuntur» (Muretus 97 *ad loc.*). Most scholars try to get round this difficulty by interpreting *meis* as a corruption. The emendation which has enjoyed the widest acceptance is the simplest and the most obvious, *tuis* (Muretus), aided by the fact that the same process of corruption occurs in [Tib.] 3.7.1 and in the manuscript transmission of Cicero (*Sulla* 44; *Fam.* 7.33.2). Other suggested emendations are: 1) *novis* (Postgate, *Selections from Tibullus and Others*, London 1903, rev. 1910), on the grounds that Lygd. 4.57 leads the reader to assume that Lygdamus had already sung of Neaera in his poetry (the emendation most favoured by those who would see in this elegy a manifesto of neoteric style, and have no hesitation in reinterpreting *novis*, "new", as having the more Callimachean sense of "novel"); and 2) *magis* (McKay, *Latomus* 46 [1987] 213–214), in its rectifying sense equivalent to *potius* (cf. *caram magis*, l. 25).

However, there is another possibility of restoring coherence to the text without any need to do violence to the unanimous manuscript tradition: to alter the punctuation as it stands and redistribute the lines in the interplay between the interlocutors, poet and Muses: 1–6 Lygdamus; 7 Muses; 8 Lygdamus; 9–14 Muses; 15–28 Lygdamus (cf. R. Ehwald, "zu Lygdamus c. I", *Philologus* 60 (1901) 572–78; M. Schuster, *Tibullen-Studien*, Wien 1930 [repr. Hildesheim 1968] 151; G. Lieberg, "Le muse in Tibullo e nel *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Prometheus* 6 [1980] 138–139; 141–142). There is no reason why the attribution

to different interlocutors of lines 7 and 8, which belong to the same distich, should attack the principle of unity of sense of the elegiac distich, since even if each line corresponds to a different interlocutor, the two complement each other in such a way that the premises-conclusion scheme guarantees this unity of communication or sense, so much so, in fact, that this distich (on its own or together with the previous one) could easily function as an independent epigram, not even lacking the sharpness of observation reserved for all epigrammatic pentameter endings (*Neaera* = *formosa*).

As regards the sense of this distich, there are at first sight two striking points: a) the contrasting of two adjectives (*formosae*/*avarae*) which belong to different semantic fields and therefore do not have to be mutually exclusive. This was observed by Vulpius 214: «formosas opponit avaris, quasi neque in formosas avaritia, neque rursum in avaras forma cadere possit: quod non semper verum est»; b) the fact that Lygdamus decides to give some poems to Neaera, clearly ruling out in so doing the application of the term *avara* to his beloved, seems to go against the whole elegiac tradition, since continual lamentation over the insatiable avarice of the *puella* was already an intrinsic part of the poetic world of the elegiac poets, be it real or imaginary. Furthermore, for the elegiac poets beauty in a woman is a synonym for greed and perfidiousness; cf. Tib. 2.4.35–38; Navarro, *Amada codiciosa*, cap. IV ("La *forma*"), pp. 28–40 (≈ *Habis* 22 [1991] 212–213). However, the dissociation of the elegiac Beauty-Greed opposition in Lygdamus is only apparent and opportunistic. We must not forget the context of the pentameter: Lygdamus is trying to win back the favours of his *coniunx* Neaera, who has been taken from him by a rival (cf. Lygd. 2.1–4; 29–30), presumably a *dives amator*; Lygdamus' aim in this distich is: a) to charm and influence his *cara Neaera* by means of the compliment embodied in the syllogism of ll. 4–8, in which by implication she is described as beautiful, since what he is sending her as a present are *carmina*, not *munera*; b) to attempt to bring about her return; it is as if he were saying to her "forget my rich rival—allowing yourself to be seduced by money is the mark of avarice—and accept these poems of mine", or in other words, "come back to me and let yourself be seduced by my *carmina*, as is only fitting for *formosae*". This line simply turns harsh reality around (Beauty = Avarice), presenting things as Lygdamus the dreamer would like them to be (Beauty = Poetry; Avarice = Money). *Formosae* here, in opposition to *avarae*, thus takes on the almost-spiritual

connotation of totally disinterested sensitivity to poetry. Lygdamus stresses the marked moral *formosae/avarae* contrast by the studied collocation of the two adjectives in key places in the line (before the penthemimer and closing the hexameter respectively) and by means of deliberate internal rhyme (*-ae* . . . *-ae*).

Finally, it should be noted that Lygdamus contrasts the *avara puella* with the elegiac ideal of the *docta puella* (*carmina*). The elegiac poets not only praise the physical, goddess-like beauty of the beloved (*formosa puella et divina*)—on the elegiac ideal of beauty, cf. T. J. Leary, "That's what little girls are made of: the physical charms of elegiac women", *LCM* 15.10 (December 1990) 152–155—, but also like to depict her, perhaps from Hellenistic influence, as sensitive to the arts (*docta puella*), that is, gifted in dance poetry, eloquence, singing and the lyre; cf. Theocr. 18.35–36 (praise of the bride in the epithalamium); Catul. 35.16–17, *Sapphica puella / Musa doctior*; Prop. 1.2.27–30 (poetry, lyre, eloquence, sensuality and wisdom); 2.3.17–22 (dance, lyre and poetry); Hor. *Od.* 2.12.17–20 (dance); Sall. *Catil.* 25.2 (a portrait of Sempronia); Ovid devotes an extensive section of his *Ars amatoria* to recommending to the woman that she should learn to sing, develop an interest in poetry, and dance (*Ars* 3.315–350); cf. T. J. Leary, "The intellectual accomplishments of the elegiac woman", *LCM* 18.6 (June 1993) 88–91.

7 formosae //. . . avarae/: note how the hexameter's internal rhyme—a result of the homeoteleuton between the noun preceding the caesura and the one at the end of the line-highlights the antithesis between the two terms. On internal rhyme, cf. Lygd. 1.2 *nostris* // . . . *avis*/ (comm.).

formosae: the usual adjective when describing the breath-taking beauty of the elegiac beloved (cf. Lygd. 4.25, *formosius*, and 57, *formosa Neaera*; Pichon, pp. 153–154 s.v.). According to Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, pp. 60–61, *formosus* is not a completely unpoetic term, since although frequent in the elegiac poets (Tib. 6 [1:4, 2:2]; Prop. 35 [1:9, 2:21, 3:3, 4:2]; «aggetivo caro ai poeti neoterici» in the view of Fedeli 96–97 *ad* Prop. 1.2.9), it nevertheless does appear in epic, though extremely rarely, and is frequent in Ovid (83 times: *Am.* 22; *Her.* 12; *Ars* 11; *Rem.* 4; *Met.* 23; *Fasti* 9; *Tr.* 1; *Pont.* 1). Indicative of its intermediate poetic status, halfway between the lower and the more elevated genres, are the statistics for its appearance in the *Corpus Virgilianum*: 16 times in pastoral poetry, only once in didactic poetry (*Ge.* 3.219, *formosa iuvenca*), and never in epic. Horace rarely uses it (4

times in all: *Sat.* 2, *Carm.* 1, *Ars* 1). Like some other words in *-osus*, *formosus* no doubt had a rather trivial stamp which made it less suitable for elevated poetry than *pulcher*, though more appropriate than the popular *bellus* (cf. Lygd. 4.52 [comm.]). McKeown (111–112 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.5.11), however, attributes the reluctance to use this adjective in the more elevated poetic genres to its added connotations of sexual attraction (in contrast with *pulcher*, an objective term describing physical or moral beauty), which made it inappropriate for epic and tragedy: never in the *Aeneid*, Valerius Flaccus, Silius Italicus or the *Thebais* and *Achilleis* of Statius; only once in the latter's *Silvae* and in Luc. *Civ.* 10.366; and in the tragedies of Seneca, only in *Oed.* 508; *Phaed.* 772 and 781; cf. also P. Monteil, *Beau et Laid en Latin* (Paris 1964) 71–109 (for *formosus/pulcher*) and 23–60 (for the semantic evolution of *formosus*); A. Ernout, "Unpoetische Wörter", *RPh* 21 (1947) 64–67; Watson, *Axelson revisited*, pp. 439–441. Still, it is striking that Catullus should only use this adjective in one epigram, albeit three times over (86.1; 3; 5).

The adjective *formosae* here functions as a noun, as is often the case in Augustan poetry; for a similar use of the masculine, cf. [Verg.] *Catal.* 5.7, *iam valete, formosi!*; Tib. 1.4.3; 9.6; Prop. 4.4.52; Ov. *Her.* 15.95, *formose*; *Ars* 2.117; *Met.* 10.611; *ThLL* 6.1.1112.84 ff.; for the more frequent feminine as a noun, cf. Tib. 2.3.65; [Tib.] 3.10.4; Prop. 1.15.8; 2.16.26; 22.20; 24.40; 28.10 and 13; Ov. *Am.* 1.8.43, *ludunt formosae.* For both cases, this use is first attested in prose in Sen. *Contr.* 2.7.3 and 10.4.17; for statistics, and adjectival and substantival uses of *formosus* in the elegiacs, see E. Bréguet, *Le roman de Sulpicia* (Roma 1972 = Genève 1946) 156–157. On adjectives in *-osus*, cf. A. Ernout, *Les adjectifs latins en '-osus' et en '-ulentus*, Paris 1949.

7 pretio: the term *pretium* here does not exclusively imply money, but alludes to the costly gifts (*munera*) with which, as if following a "tariff" scheme, the elegiac poets had to "buy" the *fides* of the loved one if they wanted to prevent her from running off with a richer rival. In opposition to *munus*, *pretium* here denounces in all its crudity the hidden reality of elegiac love, which is quite simply venal. For the *carmina/pretium* contrast, cf. Tib. 2.4.13–14, *nec prosunt elegi nec carminis auctor Apollo: / illa cava pretium flagitat usque manu.* For further examples in Catullus and the elegiac poets, cf. Pichon, p. 239 s.v. *pretium.* On the terms for such gifts, cf. N. Zagagi, "Amatory Gifts and Payments: A Note on *munus, donum, data* in Plautus", *Glotta* 65 (1987) 129–132; on *munera* in the elegiac poets, cf. Navarro,

Amada Codiciosa, pp. 12–24 (≈ *Habis* 22 [1991] 211–212).

7 capiuntur: in erotic language this term, characteristic of the *sermo castrensis*, takes on the figurative sense of "captivate, seduce, conquer"; cf. Prop. 1.1.1, *Cynthia prima suis miserum me cepit ocellis*; Pichon, pp. 98–99; *ThLL* 3.337.74 ff.

7 avarae: "greedy". On elegiac women as *avarae puellae*, see F. Navarro Antolín, *Amada codiciosa y Edad de Oro en los elegíacos latinos*, unpublished 'Tesis de Licenciatura' Universidad de Sevilla 1991 (in shortened form in *Habis* 22 [1991] 207–221).

8: echoed in Lygd. 4.57, *carminibus celebrata tuis formosa Neaera.*

gaudeat . . . versibus: cf. Hor. *Od.* 4.8.11–12, *gaudes carminibus; carmina possumus / donare et pretium dicere muneri.* Note a certain similarity in the situation: Horace too, possibly on the occasion of the *Saturnalia*, has to send a present to a friend, and likewise, instead of some luxurious gift, he decides to present him with his poems. There are also certain parallelisms: *gaudes, donare, pretium*, and the mention of the *Pierides* (l. 20).

8 ut digna est: the loved one always deserves everything—cf. *meritam* (l. 21)—and is above all other women: her beauty justifies the poetic tribute; cf. [Tib.] 3.8.15, *sola puellarum digna est*, and 24, *dignior est vestro* (= Pieridum) *nulla puella choro*; Ov. *Am.* 1.10.60–61, *est quoque carminibus meritas celebrare puellas / dos mea.*

9–14: the Muses stress that Lygdamus should pay great attention to the appearance of his poetic gift. The restrictive *sed* (l. 9) and the 'collectio' *sic etenim comptum mittere oportet opus* (l. 14) define the limits of this new intervention from them.

The passage constitutes an extremely detailed literary description of what a luxury edition of a book might well have been in Antiquity. The oldest Roman books did not have the present squared format (*codices*), but came in rolls (*volumina*), and the material used for writing was papyrus. The ancient book was in essence a simple length of rolled papyrus, such as the *volumina* found in Herculaneum. Only the rolls which would be read with a certain frequency were wound around a cylinder of wood or bone (*umbilicus*) to protect the fragile papyrus, which in this way suffered less damage than it would if rolled around itself. The element of luxury lay, for example, in the following features: the back of the sheet of papyrus was treated with extremely expensive cedar oil to protect and preserve it from termites (cf. Vitr. 2.9.13), perfume it and give it an elegant yellowish tone (*cedro flavus*,

Hor. *Poet.* 332; Ov. *Tr.* 3.1.13); the edges of the papyrus were well smoothed, and rubbed down with a pumice-stone (*pumex*); the *umbilicus* (or *umbilici*) was made of ivory, with the painted ends projecting from the roll (*cornua*) to help to protect it; there would be a label indicating in red letters the name of the author and the title of the work (*titulus* or *index*); the roll would have a leather cover (*membrana* or *paenula*) wrapped round it for protection; it would have ribbons or painted straps (*lora rubra*) to keep it rolled up; cf. Birt, *Buchwessen*, pp. 64 ff.; *Abriss*, pp. 329 ff. Such collectors' editions apparently already existed in Greece, where there must have been an active and flourishing trade in books as luxury items, designed to be shown off rather than read; cf. eg Luc. *Merc. Cond.* 41, ὅμοιοί εἰσι τοῖς καλλίστοις τούτοις βιβλίοις, ὧν χρυσοῖ μὲν οἱ ὀμφαλοί, πορφυρᾶ δὲ ἔκτοσθεν ἡ διφθέρα. On books and the book trade in the Graeco–Latin world, see the chapters devoted to the subject in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature I: Greek Literature* (P. E. Easterling-B. M. W. Knox, eds.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1985, pp. 17–20 (= Madrid: Gredos 1990, pp. 30–35); *II: Latin Literature* (E. J. Kenney-W. v. Clausen, eds.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1982, pp. 15–22 (= Madrid: Gredos 1982, pp. 28–36); H. Escolar, *Historia del libro*, Salamanca-Madrid 1988, pp. 113–183 (with bibliography after each chapter); E. Ruiz, *Manual de codicología*, Madrid-Salamanca 1988, pp. 36–45 (papyrus); 97–100 (rolls); 257–276 (production and trading of manuscripts in Greece and Rome).

In including such a description of the physical appearance of the book in the prologue-poem, Lygdamus is following the example of Catul. 1.1–2, but in the comprehensive details of the description itself he is much closer to the prologue-poem of Bk I of the *Tristia* of Ovid (ll. 5–12); (cf. also Catul. 22.5–8). With the *neoterici* the physical embellishment of the book became an external symbol of the internal "finish" of the poems it contained (cf. Cinna fr. 11 Büchner [= *FPL* p. 89 Morel]; Catul. 1.1–2; Prop. 3.1.8, *exactus tenui pumice versus eat*; Hor. *Ep.* 1.20.1–2, *liber . . . pumice mundus*; Mart. 1.117.16, *rasum pumice*; 3.2.7–11; 11.1.1–2; and a frustrated attempt in Catul. 22); correspondingly, the absence of external embellishment reflects the lack of this internal "finish" (cf. Ov. *Tr.* 1.1.5–12; Mart. 4.10.1–2; 8.72.1–2). In the neoteric and elegiac poets the physical polish of the book symbolizes the polished style: their poetry is the product of the πόνος and ἀγρυπνία required by τέχνη in accordance with the Callimachean manifesto. The terms used to describe the appearance of the book

are thus imbued with a metaphorical double meaning which alludes programatically to the Alexandrian principles of its content; cf. F. Cairns, "Catullus I", *Mnemosyne* 22 (1969) 154; F. O. Copley, "Catullus, c. 1", *TAPhA* 82 (1951) 201–2; T. P. Elder, "Catullus I, his Poetic Creed, and Nepos", *HSCP* 71 (1966) 143–149; P. Levine, "Catullus c. 1: A Playful Dedication", *CSCA* 2 (1969) 210; K. Quinn, *Catullus: The Poems* (London 1973) 89 *ad loc.*; D. O. Ross, *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge 1969) 108; T. Hubbard, "The Catullian *Libellus*", *Philologus* 127 (1983) 221–222. In this connection, M. Parca ("The position of Lygdamus in Augustan Poetry", *St. in Lat. Lit. and Rom. Hist.* IV, C. Deroux [ed.], Bruxelles 1986, pp. 461–474) also sees something similar in Lygd. 1.7–14: "The particular use of *versibus novis*, *libellum*, *comptum* and *cultum*, the key words of the Catullan manifesto promoting a new style of poetry—terse, polished and learned—further indicate that Lygdamus intended his poem to be a Callimachean declaration" (p. 464). Continuing in the same line a few years later is G. D. Williams ("Representations of the Book-Roll in Latin Poetry: Ovid, *Tr.* 1.1.3–14 and the related Texts", *Mnemosyne* 45 [1992] 178–189): "for the most part in lines 7–14 the poet limits himself to a description of the physical characteristics of the book, but the overtones of *novis* (8) and *comptum* (14) extend to the nature of its contents. As in Catullus 1, *novis* suggests the neoteric credentials of a work which is as trim (*comptum*) in style as it is in physical appearance".

However, the description in Lygdamus—as is well brought out by M.-P. Pieri, "L'omaggio del libro in Ligdamo", *QILL* 4 (1982) 57–59—appears to be unconnected with this neoteric and elegiac tradition, and void of any literary implication, being reduced to a mere description of the physical characteristics of the book (as Williams himself admits: "for the most part in lines 7–14"): *novis* is no more than an ingenious conjecture (Postgate) and the neoteric credentials of *comptum*—*pace* Erath 30 ff.—are dubious here, since l. 14 simply synthesizes all that has been stated in the previous lines, and if these in no way point metaphorically to the style, this can hardly be claimed for the resumé line. Besides, if we accept a late dating for the Lygdamus cycle, the Callimachean principles would no longer be so new, nor their followers so few, as to have to plead on their behalf. What we have here is simply a detailed description of the *ornamenta* of a book on which no effort has been spared to make it attractive, since it is a gift, and one intended for a woman on whom the donor

wishes to cause a pleasant impression with its luxurious appearance—*avara puella?*—so that she will feel tempted to read what is inside, since the poet hopes to move her with its contents—referred to programmatically in ll. 23–28.

9 lutea sed niveum involvat membrana libellum: for their protection, luxury volumes were kept in a leather cover (*membrana*, *paenula*, Gr. διφθέρα) which for aesthetic reasons was generally dyed purple; cf. Catul. 22.7, *lora rubra membranae*; Ov. Tr. 1.1.5, *nec te purpureo velent vaccinia fuco* (with Luck 12–13); Mart. 1.66.11; 117.16, *purpuraque cultum* (with Citroni 358); 3.2.10, *te* [scil. *libellum*] *purpura delicata velet*; 8.72.1, *murice cultus*; 10.93.3–4, *nondum vulgata . . . / carmina, purpure sed modo culta toga*; 11.1.2 [*liber*] *cultus Sidone non cotidiana* (with Kay 54); 14.84; Juv. 7.23; Stat. *Silv.* 4.9.7, *purpureus* (*libellus*); Lucian. *Ind.* 7; *Merc. Cond.* 41; Marquardt-Mau 817–818; Birt, *Buchwesen*, pp. 64–65; *Kunst*, pp. 239–240. However, it seems that other shades were possible (cf. Isid. *Orig.* 6.11.4, *membrana . . . aut candida aut lutea aut purpurea*). The purple was extracted, depending on the place and period, either from the purple-fish (*murex*), or from the lichen known as sea-orchil (*fucus*), or else from bilberries or whortleberries (*vaccinium Myrtillus*). A more effective means of protection for the ancient book than a leather pouch seems to have been a wooden case; cf. Mart. 14.84, *ne toga barbatos faciat vel paenula libros / haec abies chartis tempora longa dabit.*

This is the only passage which mentions a cover that is saffron— or golden-yellow (*lutea*) in colour. The commentators (eg Némethy 34; Tescari 220 n. 1; Tränkle 71) offer the explanation that this is because yellow is the colour of love and conjugal union; cf. Tib. 1.8.52, *luto corpora tingit amor*; 2.2.18, *flavaque coniugio vincula portet Amor*; Plin. *Nat.* 21.46, where the nuptial veil is said to have been yellow (cf. Catul. 61.8–10 [with Fordyce 239–240]; Ov. *Met.* 10.1; Luc. *Civ.* 2.361, *nou . . . nuptae . . . lutea demissos velarunt flammea vultus*). This would tie in well with Lygdamus' desire to live with Neaera in matrimony.

lutea sed niveum: an identical opposition of colours is found in Catul. 61.9–10 (to *Hymenaeum*), *huc veni niveo gerens / luteum pede soccum.*

lutea sed: the transposition of *sed* is an example of the tendency to transpose particles (*at*, *atque*, *aut*, *et*, *nam*, *namque*, *nec* [*neque*], *neve* [*neu*], *sed*, *sive* [*seu*], *vel*) introduced into Latin poetry by the neoterics on the basis of Alexandrian models; cf. eg Call. *Epigr.* 5.11, Κλεινίου ἀλλὰ θυγατρὶ δίδου χάπιν; Theocr. 21.34, ἄλλως καὶ σχολά ἐστι; see references in Pfeiffer's index to Callimachus, s.vv. ἀλλά, καί; and cf. Gow 175 *ad* Theocr. 8.23, ἔτι καί. This mannerism arises principally

out of mere metrical convenience. As for *sed*, this particle is first postponed in Catul. 51.9, and later frequently in the Augustan poets: in second position in the phrase in Catul. 51.9; Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.89; 2.46; *Od.* 4.4.33; Verg. *Ecl.* 4.43; *Aen.* 1.19; 353; 3.37; 586; 5.320; 6.315; 7.704; 736; 11.63; 631; 816; Tib. 1.7.46; 8.63; 2.4.3; Prop. 1.4.11; *Paneg. Mess.* (= [Tib.] 3.7).34; Lygd. 1.19; in third position in its phrase in Verg. *Aen.* 5.5, *duri magno sed amore dolores*; 6.28; Prop. 2.24.42, *credo ego* **sed** *multos non habuisse fidem*; in fourth position in the phrase and in the 2nd half of the pentameter in Lygd. 5.28; in Ovid, where the phenomenon of postposition of the particle is very frequent, *sed* can even occupy fifth (*Fasti* 6.336) and sixth position in the pentameter (*Tr.* 5.1.38; after Ovid, cf. Luc. *Civ.* 4.403; Mart. 6.93.2 [4th]; Stat. *Silv.* 4.5.50; Juv. 10.118. For this phenomenon in the Latin context, see Fordyce 153 *ad* Catul. 23.7 (*nam*); Austin 35 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 4.33 *Veneris nec praemia*; Norden, *Aen. VI*, Anh. III, pp. 402–404 (for *sed*, cf. p. 404); Fedeli *Prop. IV* 143; Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, pp. 93–96 (with numerous *loci Ovidiani* not cited above).

niveum: papyrus was produced in varying degrees of clarity; the greater the clarity, the higher the quality; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 13.78, *spectatur in chartis tenuitas, densitas, candor, levor.* A luxury edition would therefore have to use papyrus that was snow-white (*niveum*).

libellum: *liber* or its diminutive *libellum* is understood here as the already-written volume or roll (Gr. βιβλίον); for the different meanings of *liber* and the distinction between *liber* and *volumen*, cf. E. J. Kenney-W. v. Clausen (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature II: Latin Literature*, Cambridge University Press 1982, pp. 15 and 30–31 (Excursus 1. The sense of *liber*) (= Madrid: Gredos 1982, pp. 28 and 45). The diminutive *libellum*, like the *parve liber* of other authors (cf. Ov. *Tr.* 1.1.9; Mart. 1.3.2), does not necessarily indicate a small book, but in fact can often refer, like *liber*, to a large volume; it is therefore first and foremost an emotional term of endearment, and also denotes modesty or sometimes the relatively lightweight nature of the topic. It is used principally in poetry; cf. eg Catul. 1.1; Ov. *Am. Epigr.* 1; Mart. 1 *praef.* 1; 1.3; Stat. *Silv.* 1 *praef.*

10: "and let the pumice-stone carefully shave off the white threads". Since the papyrus was made from vegetable fibre and could therefore easily fray, in order to prevent this the edges were carefully smoothed with pumice-stone; cf. Catul. 1.2, *libellum arida modo pumice expolitum*; 22.8, *pumice omnia aequata*; Ov. *Tr.* 1.1.11–12, *nec fragili geminae poliantur pumice frontes, / hirsutus sparsis ut videare comis* (with Luck 13);

Mart. 1.66.10, *pumicata fronte*; 117.16, *rasum pumice*; 8.72.1–2, *asperoque / morsu pumicis aridi politus*. In view of the fact that this operation took place once the roll was already written upon, by way of finishing off and culminating the literary work, the reference to polishing with the pumice-stone became the metaphor *par excellence* among Latin poets to symbolize the quest for grace and elegance of style, the effort of the *limae labor* (Hor. *Poet* 291) which is always called for if a work is to be finished properly (*vigilatum carmen*), and the Callimachean πόνος taken up as a poetic manifesto by the *poetae docti*.

There is, however, a long process of evolution from the veiled metaphor of Catul. 1.2 to the more explicit one in Ov. *Ponto* 1.5.61, *cur ego sollicita poliam mea carmina cura?*, these two examples being bridged by Prop. 3.1.8, *exactus tenui pumice versus eat*, in which Propertius openly adapted to the verse itself the image that Catullus had reserved more generically for the book. In Lygdamus, however, the allusion to polishing with the pumice-stone is obscured by the mention of other technical procedures for finishing the roll, and therefore loses all symbolic significance. In addition, Lygdamus metaphorically describes the polishing operation as if it were hair that was being cut: the frayed threads of the papyrus are its hair, more exactly its beard, which, since the papyrus is pure white, turns grey (*canas . . . comas*); in line with the metaphor, instead of the usual *(ex)poliare* (or similar) the verb used is *tondere*, "to cut the hair, trim, shave", which is inappropriate in connection with the *pumex*. The same metaphor is used by Ovid in *Tr.* 1.1.11–12, the likely model for the Lygdamus passage (cf. A. Ronconi, "Introduzione alla letteratura pseudoepigrafa", *Filologia e linguistica*, Roma 1968, 257 n. 57 [= *St. Cl. Or.* 5, 1955]; on the close relationship between Catul. 1, Lygd. 1. and Ov. *Tr.* 1.1, cf. G. Luck, *Tristia* II [Heidelberg 1977] 11–13; H. B. Evans, *Publica Carmina. Ovid's Books from Exile* [Lincoln-London 1983] 33; M. Parca, *art. cit.*, 463–466), except that in Ovid the emphasis is on the image of these same unsmoothed threads: his book must have the look of a man with his hair dishevelled and untrimmed (*squalidus*), like Romans fighting duels or seeking to arouse pity in order to win clemency, as was the case of the accused facing the court or defeated soldiers in the presence of the victorious general. For Williams ("Book-Roll in Latin Poetry . . .", *Mnemosyne* 45 [1992] 186–187) Ovid's *liber hirsutus* recalls the *hirsuti Getae* (*Ponto* 1.5.74) and symbolizes the supposed stylistic crudity of his work in exile in comparison with his superior poetry of other times -*hirsutus* is the adjective with which

Ovid always describes Ennius and his *Annales*, with a double literary-critical meaning; cf. *Tr.* 2.259 and 424; cf. also Prop. 4.1.61)—in addition to his declining poetic talent. Lygdamus and Ovid are therefore very careful about the external appearance of their books, but in opposite ways: Lygdamus aims to send the most luxurious and elegant book possible, for it must not be forgotten that the recipient is a woman on whom the poet wants to make a favourable impression, and that this is a gift sent on a festive occasion. Ovid, on the other hand, is in no festive mood; what he is aiming at is to move and soften the heart of Caesar so that he will lift the sentence of exile that has been imposed on him or at least transfer him to somewhere more welcoming than the inhospitable Tomis; his work must therefore give the most pitiful and miserable image possible of his unhappy *relegatio*, both by the plaintive nature of its contents (*flebile carmen*), and its sorry outward appearance (*hirsutus liber*). In view of this, in the case of Ovid the content and form of the book combine more satisfactorily: the outward appearance of the book interprets the state of mind of the poet.

In addition, note that a similar metaphor personifying the "spruced-up book" is to be found in Hor. *Ep.* 1.20.1–2, *liber . . . pumice mundus*, where Horace likens the polished book to an effeminate depilated man (hence the choice of *mundus*; the pumice-stone was used by effeminate males for the purpose of depilation, cf. Lucil. 264; Mart. 5.41.6; Plin. *Ep.* 2.11.23); there is a similar personification of the book of poems as a dandy in Mart. 1.17.16, *rasum pumice purpuraque cultum* (with Howell 351); 8.72.1–2, *nondum murice cultus asperoque / morsu pumicis aridi politus*. In Martial, too, there is a reference to the beard of a frayed book (cf. 14.84, *barbatos . . . libros*). Note a similar personification, this time with the more prosaic image of the *lima*, presented as an instrument of torture and the *libellum* as its victim, in Stat. *Silv.* 4.7.25–26, *nostra / 'Thebais' multa* ***cruciata*** *lima* (with Coleman 203–204).

pumex et: the unanimous reading of the mss. *pumicet et* cannot be maintained, as it would force *membrana* (l. 9) to be interpreted as the subject of *pumicet* and *tondeat*, unless we either assume a lacuna before l. 10 containing the subject, presumably a bookseller (Cartault), or else we agree with Boscherini ("Un uso impersonale in Ligdamo [I.10–12]", *A & R* 4 [1959] 152–54) that what we are faced with here is an impersonal use of the 3rd person characteristic of technical language—here that of the bookseller—with which there is no

need for a subject to be expressed, as it can easily be deduced from the setting or activity evoked (cf. Cato *Agr.* 86; Varro *Rust.* 1.40; Cels. 3.13). However, the most widely-accepted solution involves the emendation to *pumex et*, which we owe to some humanist scholar and which already appears in the *deteriores*, in G² (*i. ras.*) and in the margin of the copy of the *editio Aldina* of 1515 in the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid (R. 34671). This reading (together with the emendation to *charta*, l. 11) has the advantage of being more in line with the animation of the technical elements relating to the ancient book (*membrana*, *pumex*, *charta*, *littera*). Lygdamus even falls back on the passive in l. 13 in order not to break the animation thus created. However, acceptance of *pumicet* and *chartae* would leave three verbs without a subject (*pumicet*, *tondeat*, *praetexat*) in open contrast to the clearly personal syntactical constructions preceding (l. 9, *involvat membrana*) and following (l. 13, *pingantur cornua*), a shift without parallel in Latin poetry. Moreover, *pumicet* and *tondeat* add nothing new to each other. *Pumex cui* (Huschke) is further removed from the manuscript tradition and introduces a subordinate relative clause where we might expect an impossible *totonderit* alongside *ante*; *pumex ei*, taking the line as being in parentheses, as proposed by K. Dziatzko (*Untersuchungen über ausgewählte Capitel des antiken Buchwesens*, pp. 117 ff.) is unthinkable, since a monosyllabic *ei* as dative of *is* is unknown in the elegiac poets (only in Ov. *Hal.* 34; cf. Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, p. 116); nor is the conjecture *pumice sed* by R. Ehwald ("Zu Lygdamus c. 1", *Philologus* 60 [1901] 575) very convincing, since it not only fails to resolve the subject of *tondeat*, but also produces a clumsy repetition of *sed* (ll. 9–10).

arte: the reading *ante* of the oldest mss. contributes nothing substantial to the text, and it would therefore not be too daring to incorporate the tempting reading *arte* ('aliqui deteriores', *editio Aldina* 1515, *editio Aldina* 1567 of Ach. Statius, Guyetus), which is more in line with the idea of the painstaking care that is involved in producing a luxury edition, in which the closest attention is paid to the smallest details.

comas: on the terms for "hair" in Latin poetry, see Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, p. 51; Lyne 171 *ad* [Verg.] *Cir.* 168. In the more elevated genres (in particular Virgil, Virgilian-style epic and Sen. *Trag.*) the prosaic *capillus* is rare (with the exception of Ovidian epic), while *coma* and *crinis* are more frequent: Verg. 2/28/30 respectively; Sen. *Trag.* 4/61/20; Luc. 2/27/20; Val.-Flac. 2/18/25; Sil. 2/24/27; Stat. 4/90/84; Ov. *Met.* 64/32/38 (Lucr. only uses *coma*, and that just

once). In comedy and satire, on the other hand, *capillus* is in general more frequent than the other two terms: Pl. 8/0/3; Ter. 4/0/0; Hor. *Sat.* 2/0/0; Pers. 1/0/0; Juv. 5/5/7. In lyric, too, *capillus* is fairly frequent: Catul. 2/5/4; Hor. 11/10/12. The same occurs in elegy, where *coma* is the most frequent term and *crinis* the least frequent: Tib. I–II 11/24/7; Lygd. 2/3/1; [Tib.] IV 1/2/1; Prop. 15/29/8; Ovid. 98/128/38. The term *caesaries* only appears once in elegy (Ov. *Am.* 3.1.32), although it is not infrequent in poetry (eg Catul. 1; Hor. 1; Verg. 5; Ov. *Met.* 7; Sil. 4; Val.-Flac. 1; Sen. *Trag.* 1; Juv. 1).

11–12: "and may the top be decorated (finished off) with a small sheet (= label) / indicating your name in writing (= inscription)". This is a distich that has been faultily transmitted in a manuscript tradition that presents three difficulties: a) the verb in the hexameter is transmitted in a great variety of forms, although from the time of the earliest editors the reading *praetexat* has been accepted; b) if the traditional *c(h)artae* is kept, the subject of this verb has to be assumed to be the same as that of the subordinate *ut* clause, that is, *littera facta* (*tenuis . . . chartae* consequently becoming a genitive dependent on *summa . . . fastigia*); otherwise, the only possibility is to follow the reading *charta* (Datanus, Becker), thus furnishing *praetexat* with its own subject, which seems a more appropriate solution given the animation undergone in the present context by the different elements that play a part in the process of finishing the *luxuriosus liber* (see comm. on *pumex et*, l. 10); c) the unanimous manuscript tradition transmits *facta*; however, the supposedly empty content of this "filler" in the phrase *littera facta* has given rise, since the earliest editors, to all sorts of conjectures: eg *picta* (Livineius), *pacta* (Tuscanella), *festa* (Müller), *vasta* (Havet), *rubra* (Némethy). Of all the proposed interpretations that do not do violence to the unanimous manuscript tradition there are three which merit particular attention: a) *facta* = *pulchre facta*, a pregnant use, as in ποιητός = εὖ ποιητός and πεποιημένος = τεχνικῶς πεποιημένος; however, the few *loci similes* adduced in its support are dubious; cf. Cic. *De or.* 3.201, *orationem, quae quidem sit polita atque facta* **quodam modo**; *Brut.* 30, *accurata et facta* **quodam modo** *oratio*; Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.58, *versiculos . . . magis factos et euntis / mollius*; Ov. *Her.* 5.2; b) *facta* = *arte facta* (cf. Cato *Agr.* 21.5, *ferrum factum . . . idem faber figat*; Verg, *Aen.* 10.527–528, *auri pondera facti / infectique*; Sil. 13.357); given that it is the title of the book and not the literary quality of the poems that is being referred to, the point is that the letters of the *index* should be artfully written (M.-P. Pieri, "L'omaggio del libro in

Ligdamo", *QILL* 4 [1982] 61); c) the expression *litteras facere* instead of *litteras scribere* was frequent in Latin; cf. Pl. *As.* 767; Cic. *Ac.* 4.2; Ov. *Her.* 5.2, *littera facta manu/*; *Ponto* 2.10.4, *cognitane est nostra littera facta manu*; Justin. 27.2; cf. P. H. Damsté, "Ad Lygdami elegias", *Mnemosyne* 36 (1908) 205–206; *ThLL* 6.1.88.26 ff. s.v. *facio* (O. Hey). This last interpretation would seem to be the most reasonable, even if it verges on the pleonastic, a defect which, it must be said, occurs with some frequency in Lygdamus; cf. 2.15, *praefatae ante meos manes*; 3.9, *permenso defunctus tempore lucis*; 4.47–48, *aevique futuri / eventura.*

Whatever the case, what is certainly clear is that this distich uses an elaborate periphrasis to allude to the practice of providing luxury editions with a label (*index* or *titulus*, Gr. σίλλυβος), on which was written the name of the author and/or the title of the work—preferably in red ink (minium or vermillion) to stand out more (the possible emendations take this fact into account)—and which was attached to the top of the roll in such a way as to project from it and be easily visible even when the volume was rolled up. The hexameter refers to the quality of the actual material providing *index*, the papyrus; the pentameter, to the artistic skill in the drawing of the letters. On the *titulus*, cf. Cic. *Att.* 2.15b; Ov. *Rem.* 1; *Tr.* 1.1.7, *nec titulus nimio . . . notetur* (with Luck 13); *Ponto* 1.1.15, *miserabilis index*; 4.13.7–8, *ipse quoque, ut titulum chartae de fronte revellas, / quod sit opus videor dicere posse tuum*; Mart. 3.2.11, *et cocco rubeat superbus index*; Sen. *Dial.* 9 (*De tranqu.*) 9.6; Quint. *Inst.* 2.14.4; Plin. *Ep.* 5.15.3. Everything suggests, then, that the hexameter deals with the label in itself as physical support for the title, indicating the type of material to be used, *charta*, and its size (or texture?), *tenuis*, and its positioning on the roll, *summaque praetexat . . . fastigia*; whereas the pentameter is reserved for the inscription written on the label in red. In this way, moreover, each line of the description of the *luxuriosus liber* would have its own subject. In the view of Boscherini, *praetexat* would be impersonal, as would *pumicet*, which he defends, and *tondeat* (l. 10).

11 tenuis: may refer to either the quantity or the quality of the papyrus; this will obviously depend on the reading followed, *charta* or *chartae.* If we opt for *charta*, *tenuis* can only refer to quantity, since we are talking about the label, which is small; if we choose *chartae*, it then refers to quality, since it now alludes to the texture of the length of papyrus making up the *volumen*, the finest being the most luxurious (cf. Plin. Nat. 13.78, *spectatur in chartis tenuitas, densitas, candor, levor*). Some would see in *tenuis* a declaration of Alexandrian credentials

(λεπτός; cf. Erath 30 ff.; W. Stroh, *Die röm. Liebeselegie als werbende Dichtung* [Amsterdam 1971] 128), but it is used here in its proper sense: there is no allusion to the language of literary criticism. The emendation *titulus* for *tenuis* (Birt, *Buchwesen*, p. 67) is most implausible.

12 nomen . . . tuum: a reference to the name of the poet, that is, *LYGDAMVS*. Some editors (Broukhusius, Heyne-Wunderlich, Baehrens, Hiller, Lenz-Galinsky) prefer the reading *meum* of some of the *deteriores*, not appreciating that Lygdamus has here initiated a dialogue with the Muses as Muretus correctly observed, *tuum* therefore lacking all logic for them. Others, though not accepting the *dialogus cum Musis*, keep *tuum*, but apply it to *NEAERA*. Finally Ber.[2] offers the reading *suum*, clearly referring to *NEAERA*. These last two possibilities are based on the elegiac practice of giving the name of the loved one to the book of poems inspired by her, although other authors believe that the title of these books was the generic one of *Amores* (cf. F. Jacoby, "Amores", *RhM* 60 [1905] 463–464 with discussion of the present passage in n. 1).

13 atque inter geminas pingantur cornua frontes: a real *crux interpretum*, this hexameter has aroused from the beginning impassioned argument, not only among scholars interested in the elegies of Lygdamus, but logically among researchers studying the book in Antiquity. Neither group has yet reached an agreement on what is meant here and elsewhere by the terms *frontes* and *cornua*. Traditionally the *cornua* have been thought to be the two curved ends or tips—whence the name, although others maintain that it comes from the material used—of the *umbilicus* (the stick around which the whole *volumen* was wound; cf. comm. on ll. 9–14), which jutted out from the roll, helping to keep it in good condition and preventing the papyrus from slipping. As regards *frontes*, it used to be assumed that the Romans used this term to denote the upper and lower margins of the length of papyrus making the *volumen*. Th. Birt (*Die Buchrolle in der Kunst* [Leipzig 1907] 228 ff.; "Abriss des antiken Buchwessens", *Kritik und Hermeneutik* [München 1913] 299 and 329–330) threw out some revolutionary hypotheses: 1) the *umbilicus* was not fixed, attached to the very end of the roll, but placed into it loose; 2) the *cornua* are not the ends of the *umbilicus*, sticking out from the roll, but the first and last sheets of the *volumen*; 3) the *frontes* are not the top and bottom margins of the sheet of papyrus but the cut of the volume, corresponding to the edge of a modern book. However, H. Blümner ("*Umbilicus* und *cornua*", *Philologus* 73 [1916] 426–445, esp. pp. 436–

437 for Lygd. 1.13) replied in great detail, defending the traditional theories and demonstrating the inaccuracy of Birt's conclusions.

Nevertheless, even maintaining the traditional and widely-accepted interpretation of these technical terms, there remains the major obstacle of *inter*, since—as Wolters rightly observed (*Archäol. Jahrb.* 24 [1909] 58 n. 8)—whether one decides to understand *cornua* literally or, following Dziatzko (*Untersuchungen über ausgewählte Capitel des antiken Buchwesens*, p. 119), prefers to interpret it metaphorically as referring to the complete *umbilicus*, the *cornua* are not positioned between the *frontes*, but quite the opposite. Some commentators (since Dissen 320) have attempted to get round this by taking *inter* in the sense of 'in quibus mediis' and therefore *inter geminas frontes* as 'inter utramque frontem', given that the *cornu* is in the centre of the rolled-up *frons*. However, *inter* in this sense (close to that of *in* + ablative and *intra*) is always used with a plural (*inter greges*, *armenta*) or a collective singular (*inter exercitum*, *multitudinem*). The solution thus calls for an alteration to the text. Previously critics have consistently considered emending the unsatisfactory *inter*. There are three possibilities along these lines: 1) *super*, but the accusative is dubious here; 2) *intra*, "inside", "within" (Blümner, *art. cit.*, p. 437); 3) *infra* (Luck). Finally, there is another possible solution which is very simple and does less violence to the manuscript tradition, already put forward by Wunderlich (p. 269): *atque inter geminae pingantur cornua frontes*, a conjecture recently taken up again by D. M. Possanza ("*Cornua* and *frontes* in [Tibullus] 3.1.13", *CQ* 44 [1994] 281–282).

As regards the literary texts, the *umbilicus* is not only mentioned as an *ornamentum* for the roll (cf. Hero *Aut.* 26.3 [= 1.432 Schmidt]; Luc. *Ind.* 7; 16; *Merc. Cond.* 41; Catul. 22.7; Mart. 1.66.12, *nec umbilicis cultus*; 2.6.10–11; 3.2.9, *licet . . . pictis luxurieris umbilicis*; 5.6.14–15, *quae cedro decorata purpuraque / nigris pagina crevit umbilicis*; 8.61.4; Stat. *Silv.* 4.9.8, (*libellus*) *binis decoratus umbilicis*; Capel. 5.566; Sidon. *Ep.* 8.16.1;), but at times, since it was placed at the end of the roll, it is alluded to metaphorically in expressions intended to suggest the aim of reading the book to the very end (Sen. *Suas.* 6.27, *librum usque umbilicum revolvere*; Mart. 11.107.1, *explicitum nobis usque ad sua cornua librum* [with Kay 285–286]; Anon. *AP* 9.540 [= D.L. 9.16], μὴ ταχὺς Ἡρακλείτου ἐπ' ὀμφαλὸν εἴλεε βίβλον) or even the act of writing them (Hor. *Epod.* 14.7–8, *iambos / ad umbilicum adducere*; Porph. *ad loc.*, *in fine libri umbilici ex ligno aut osse solent poni*; Mart. 4.89.1–2, *ohe, iam satis est, ohe, libelle, / iam pervenimus usque ad umbilicos*; on the *umbilicus*, cf. Marquardt,

Privatleben 816; E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri* (Oxford 1968) 7; on the debated existence of rolls with two *umbilici*, one at the beginning and another at the end, cf. Stat. *Silv.* 4.9.8, *binis decoratus umbilicis*; Tränkle 75 n. 12. In connection with the description of a book-roll, the *cornua* are only mentioned, apart from the present passage of Lygdamus, in Ov. *Tr.* 1.1.8, *candida* . . . *cornua* (with Luck 13), and Mart. 11.107.1, *explicitum nobis usque ad sua cornua librum*; there is no evidence for them in Greek. For the *frontes*, cf. Ov. *Tr.* 1.1.11, *geminae* . . . *frontes* (with Luck 13). In the singular, *frons* seems to tend to indicate the sheet at the top of the roll (cf. Luck 13 *ad* Ov. *Tr.* 1.1.8, *nigra* . . . *fronte*). On the various opinions and interpretations concerning these terms, see S. Besslich, "Die 'Hörner' des Buches. Zur Bedeutung von *cornua* in antiken Buchwesen", *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch*, 1973, pp. 44–50; E. J. Kenney, "Books and Readers in the Roman World", in E. J. Kenney-W. v. Clausen (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature II: Latin Literature*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 16 and 31 (Excursus 2. The sense of *cornua*) (= Madrid: Gredos 1982, pp. 45–46).

Finally, it should be observed (with Tränkle 76) how Lygdamus has erred—as elsewhere when attempting to imitate his model Ovid—in his attempt to transfer faithfully the taurine image of the *cornua* and *frons* from Ov. *Tr.* 1.1.8 (*candida nec nigra cornua fronte geras*): while Ovid achieves the visual image of a roll lying flat, with the end of the *umbilicus* sticking out on the left and right like the horns on the head of a bull (also contributing to the black-white colour contrast), in Lygdamus, even though the taurine flavour of the terms is maintained, the physical image is lost, since there can be no comparison between the *frons* in Ovid ("front sheet", that is, the outermost sheet of the roll) and the *frontes* in Lygdamus ("upper and lower margins of the sheet of papyrus"). In fact, Lygdamus has contaminated two nearby lines of his Ovidian model, taking from one (l. 8) the image of the horns and forehead, and from the other (l. 11) the phrase *geminae frontes*, but without realizing that *frons* and *frontes* have very different meanings in the two lines of Ovid (cf. Luck *Tr.* 13 *ad loc.*).

geminas . . . frontes: for the expression, cf. Ov. *Tr.* 1.1.11, *nec fragili geminae poliantur pumice frontes* (with Luck 13).

pingantur cornua: Tränkle 75 refers to the literal parallel in Mart. 3.2.9, *pictis luxurieris umbilicis*, a passage which is sufficient, in his view, to prove that in the present line *cornua* = *umbilicus*.

cornua frontes: for this line-ending, cf. Ov. *Met.* 15.133, *inter cornua fronti* (scil. *hostiae*)/.

14: a kind of epiphonema summarizing and concluding the detailed description of the previous lines.

etenim: particle with explicative-causal force (= "for indeed"), only attested here in the whole of the *Corp. Tib.* and avoided by most of the poets: with the exception of Lucretius, who uses it some 25 times, it is only found 6 times in Horace (*Od.* 4.5.17; the other instances are from the *Satires*: 1.6.54; 7.10; 2.3.284; 5.60; 7.37); once in Virgil (*Aen.* 7.390), Propertius (2.7.17) and epic Ovid (*Met.* 14.695); exceptionally in Ovid's *Tristia* (1.11.9; 3.3.77) and *Epistulae ex Ponto* (3.7.13); Catul., Tib., Sen. trag., Luc., Curt. and Mart. avoid this particle altogether; cf. Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, p. 123 n. 15; Williams (*Trad. & Orig.*, pp. 162–163, 760) underlines the emphatic character of these few attested cases of the particle in poetry. As regards its positioning, *etenim* normally occupies initial position in its clause. Its appearance in second position, frequent in prose only from the 2nd c. AD—the first example being Sen. *Ep.* 95.49—is, however, attested occasionally in poetry as early as Lucretius (cf. Prop. 2.7.17; *i.a.*), particularly in the pleonastic combination *quippe etenim*. On this particle, cf. Kühner-Stegmann II.2.128; Hofmann-Szantyr 509 (§ 277); Ernout-Thomas 251 (§ 432); Bassols II.117 (§ 124) and 118 (§ 126); details on its positioning in *ThLL* 5.2.916.54 ff.

comptum: a strange word in this context, since in the case of a book—an object—one would rather expect *ornatum* or *cultum* (cf. *cultum . . . libellum*, l. 17). The verb *comere* (cf. Pichon p. 107 s.v.) has a similar semantic content to *ornare*, but its use is more restricted, and generally limited to personal cleanliness, "to get spruced up", particularly of women (eg [Tib.] 3.12 [= 4.6].3, *tibi se laetissima compsit*). It is also particularly frequent in the phrase *comere capillos* or *comas* (cf. Lygd. 2.11, *longos incompta capillos*; [Tib.] 3.8.10, *seu solvit crines . . . seu compsit, comptis est veneranda comis*; *ThLL* 3.1992.25 ff.), which makes it reasonable to assume that Lygdamus still has in mind the image of the smoothing-off of the frayed threads of the book as if it were a matter of a simple cut and trim. In the choice of this term, Erath (p. 30) and Williams ("Book-Roll in Latin Poetry . . .", *Mnemosyne* 45 [1992] 181 and n. 15) see an indirect allusion to the elegant and polished style (*comptus sermo*, *comere orationem*), in accordance with Alexandrian traditions (cf. Quint. *Inst.* 8.3.42,

probabile ... Cicero id genus dici, quod non nimis est comptum: non quia comi et expolirique non debeat).

mittere: the use of this verb refers back to ll. 3–4, and paves the way at the same time for Lygdamus' plea that the Muses should act as messengers for him (ll. 15–17).

oportet: given its prosaic tone—it is well attested among the comedians and satirists, although not profusely (in Martial only in 4.37.8; in Horace 4 times: *Ep.* 1.2.49; 10.12; *Sat.* 1.6.17; 2.6.52; never in the *Odes*)—among the poets it has a strikingly limited use: never in the lengthy epics of Luc., Val.-Flac. and Sil.; never in Statius; in Enn. once (*ap.* Non. p. 232.24); Acc. once (*ap.* Cic. *Tusc.* 2.39); Lucr. once (1.778); Catul. twice (70.4; 90.3); Verg. once (*Ecl.* 6.5); Prop. 4 times (2.4.1; 8.25; 3.7.72; 4.1.70); not at all in Tib. or [Tib.]; in Ov. 9 times (*Her.* 1.83; 6.141; *Ars* 1.699; *Rem.* 23; *Met.* 7.729; *Tr.* 1.5.51; *Ponto* 3.1.6; 35; 144); in the tragedies of Seneca only in *Phoen.* 146 (in contrast with 114 times in his philosophical works); cf. also [Verg.] *Cir.* 262; *Dir.* 36; *Priap.* 39. On *oportet*, cf. Lachmann 52–53 and Bailey 735 *ad* Lucr. 1.778–779; Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, pp. 13–14; *ThLL* 9.2 737.5–12. Undoubtedly the sententious character of this pentameter favoured its use in Lygdamus: *oportet* is fairly well attested in aphorisms and proverbs (cf. *ThLL* 9.2 737.34–52), and the frequent *usus iudicialis* (cf. *ThLL* 9.2 737.53–76) adds a solemn and categorical tone.

opus: this term is applied relatively frequently to a literary production (cf. Pl. *Cas.* 7; Lucil. 342; Cic. *Att.* 16.2.1; Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.2), but there can be no doubt that here, in contrast with the expected *liber* or *libellum*, *opus* specifically denotes the book as a piece of handcraft and a real work of art, in consonance with the preceding lines in which special emphasis is placed on the ornamentation of the book itself. It is a case of the book treated as a work of art, a *cultus libellus comptum opus Lygdami*, like *pocula ... caelatum divini opus Alcimedontis* (Verg. *Ecl.* 3.37).

15–28: once again it is Lygdamus' turn to speak in this *dialogus cum Musis*. After an initial appeal to the Muses (15–16), he requests that they themselves be the ones who will take the gift-book to Neaera (17) and he gives them instructions on how to act (18–22), together with a message to Neaera from his own lips of unswerving fidelity (23–28). With this intervention from Lygdamus the dialogue and the elegy come to a close.

15–16: «I beseech you, who have inspired this poetry in me, by the

shade of Castalia and the Pieraean lakes, . . .». The τμῆσις between the preposition *per* and the phrase it governs, *Castaliamque umbram Pieriosque lacus* (l. 16), is frequent in imprecations and oaths, particularly in archaic and post-classical Latin; cf. Enn. *Scen.* 10, *per ego deum*; Pl. *Bacch.* 905, *per te, ere, obsecro deos inmortales*; *Men.* 990, *per ego vobis deos atque homines dico*; Ter. *And.* 289, *per ego te hanc nunc dextram oro*; 538, *per te deos oro et nostram amicitiam*; Verg. *Aen.* 4.314, *per ego has lacrimas dextramque tuam* (with Austin 101); 12.56–60, *Turne, per has ego te lacrimas, per si quis Amatae / tangit honos animum [. . .] / unum oro*; [Verg.] *Cir.* 273–275, *quod per te* (*te per* Hp) *divum crebros obtestor amores / perque . . . / ut . . .* (with Lyne 216–217); Tib. 1.5.7–8, *per te furtivi foedera lecti / . . . quaeso*; Ov. *Her.* 10.73, *per ego ipsa pericula iuro*; *Met.* 3.658–659, *per tibi nunc ipsum* (scil. *deum*) . . . / . . . *adiuro* (with Bömer 608); 10.29 ff., *per ego haec loca plena timoris . . . oro*; *Fasti* 2.841, *per tibi ego hunc iuro fortem castumque cruorem*; 5.551; Luc. *Civ.* 10.370; Stat. *Theb.* 10.694; Suet. *Claud.* 11.4; in prose, Liv. 23.9.2, *per ego te, inquit, quaecumque . . .*; Kühner-Stegmann II.1.584; Hofmann-Szantyr 216, 398, 692–693 (Stilistik 2.II J); Marouzeau 3.36–37; *ThLL* 1.3.58 ff. Another example of the imprecative *per* in Lygdamus is 6.47, and in the *Corpus Tibullianum* Tib. 1.5.7–8 and [Tib.] 3.11.7–8. The separation of the preposition *per* from the nouns *umbram* and *lacus* which it governs grammatically lends greater intensity to the entreaty, and reflects more effectively the urgency of the wish.

Lygdamus calls upon the Muses, to whom he grants the title of source of inspiration for his poetry (*auctores huius mihi carminis*), beseeching them in the name of the sites of poetic inspiration, the springs and woods consecrated to them. These are the places where poets are supposed to receive poetic inspiration; cf. Prop. 3.1.1–4, *nemus . . . fonte*; Prop. 3.3.1–2, *visus eram molli recubans Heliconis in umbra, / Bellerofontis qua fluit humor equi* (= Hippocrene spring on Helicon); 13, *me Castalia speculans ex arbore Phoebus*. Némethy observed striking structural and lexical similarities between Lygd. 1.15–17 and the prologue of the *Culex* (ll. 12–19), which prompted Tränkle 78 to suspect that the former is dependent on the Virgilian epyllion.

15 auctores . . . carminis: for the formula *carminis auctor*, traditionally reserved for Apollo, cf. [Verg.] *Aetna* 4, *dexter venias mihi carminis auctor* (with Goodyear 100); *Cul.* 12, *Phoebus erit nostri princeps et carminis auctor*; Tib. 2.4.13, *nec prosunt elegi nec carminis auctor Apollo*; Ov. *Fasti* 6.709; Germ. *Arat.* 2, *carminis at nobis, genitor, tu maximus auctor*; *Il. Lat.* 165–166, *sitque auctor Apollo / aspiretque libens operi per singula nostro.*

auctores: for *auctor*, generally accompanied by a genitive, cf. Verg. *Ge.* 1.27, *auctorem frugum*; Ov. *Met.* 4.257, *lucis auctor* (scil. *Apollo*); 10.673, *ades dea muneris auctor.*

16: this type of pentameter formed by two nouns, each preceded by an adjective ending in enclytic *-que* constitutes a stylistic feature common only to Lygdamus (cf. also 3.16; 5.24) and Ovid (eg *Am.* 1.3.4; *Ars* 2.24; 3.322; *Fasti* 1.384; 2.276; *Tr.* 3.9.30; 4.7.16; 18; *Ponto* 4.16.6); cf. G. Baligan, "Ancora su Ligdamo", *Aevum* 24 (1950) 282. Far from being an isolated stylistic feature, this peculiar construction of the pentameter is one of the many devices intended to endow its two parts with a symmetrical character, attested from Catullus (cf. 68.67, *isque domum nobis isque dedit dominam*); cf. E. Paratore, "A proposito di due nuovi lavori su Ligdamo", *Aevum* 22 (1948) 103–105. For other models of symmetrical pentameters in Lygdamus, cf. 2.14, *maereat haec genero, maereat illa viro*; 3.14, *Taenare sive tuis, sive Caryste tuis*; 6.48, *Iunonemque suam perque suam Venerem.*

Castaliamque umbram: *umbram* here is a kind of metonym for "shady wood". The wood in question is that of Mt. Parnassus (Phocis) where the Castalian spring is born. The spring takes its name from a maiden of Delphi who, being pursued by Apollo, threw herself into it, thus becoming its nymph. From ancient times the spring was regarded as sacred to Apollo and the Muses (although there was no place of worship to the Muses nearby; cf. Herter, *RE* 17.1562.1 ff.); cf. eg E. *Io.* 94 ff.; Theocr. 7.148, Νύμφαι, Κασταλίδες Παρνάσιον αἶπος ἔχοισαι; Hor. *Od.* 3.4.61; Ov. *Am.* 1.15.36; H. W. Parke-D. E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle* [1956²] I 27–28; A. Kambylis, *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik* (1965) 66 ff. *et passim*; W. K. C. Guthrie, *Delphic Oracle*, pp. 322–323 around the spring there apparently grew a wood with huge laurel trees, the plant of Apollo; cf. Prop. 3.3.13, *Castalia speculans ex arbore Phoebus*; Luc. *Civ.* 5.125, *Castalios circum latices nemorumque recessus*; Sen. *Oed.* 276, *frondiferae sanctae nemora Castaliae petens*; 712–713, *Castalium nemus / umbram Sidonio praebuit hospiti.* Statius in *Theb.* 1.569 refers to a wood of *robora* (?) instead of laurel.

However, there is also justification for thinking that by *umbra* Lygdamus is here alluding to some cave, since reference to caves is normal in connection with sources of poetic inspiration; cf. Prop. 3.3.27 (with Fedeli 53 *ad* Prop. 3.1.5); Ov. *Met.* 5.266.

For the phrase *Castaliamque umbram*, cf. Prop. 3.3.1, *Heliconis in umbra*, and 13, *Castalia . . . ex arbore.* For the variant *Castaliamque undam*, found in G² and adopted by Luck, cf. [Verg.] *Cul.* 17, *Castaliae . . . unda*;

Ov. *Am.* 1.15.36, *Castalia aqua*; Stat. *Silv.* 5.5.2, *Castaliae* . . . *undis*; Claud. 28.27, *Castaliae* . . . *undae* (*Castalia aqua* in Ov. *Am.* 1.15.36; Mart. 7.22.4; Fort. *Carm.* 7.11.4). The adjective *Castalius*, first used in Prop. 3.3.13 (*sup. cit.*), was initially applied strictly to the context of the Castalian spring, then at the beginning of the imperial period it was extended in Latin poetry to anything connected with Delphi and Apollo; cf. Bömer 449 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 3.14, *Castalio* . . . *antro*; Stat. *Theb.* 7.96, *Castaliis altaribus*; *ThLL Onom.* II C 240.2 ff. The Hellenizing form *Castalis* (*-dis*), Gr. Κασταλίς, is only attested in Martial (cf. 4.14.1; 9.18.8; *ThLL Onom.* II C 240.39 ff.).

Pieriosque lacus: this may be specifically the Pimplean spring, the only one consecrated to the Muses to be found in Pieria, near Mt. Olympus (Thrace), in which case *lacus* would be a poetic plural. Pieria had been associated with the Muses since Hesiod's time (cf. *Op.* 1; *Th.* 53, with West), and from at least the Hellenistic period the name Πίμπλεια (or Πίμπλα) was linked with a spring in the locality; cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.26.6–9, *o quae fontibus integris / gaudes*, . . . / . . . / *Piplea dulcis*; Johanna Schmidt, "Pimplea", *RE* 20.2 (1950) 1387 ff.; Roscher 3.2508 f.; Fordyce 393 *ad* Catul. 105.1. But it may also refer in general to all the fountains sacred to the Muses; that is, Hippocrene, Aganippe and Permessus on Mt. Helicon; Libethrias in Thessaly; and the above-mentioned Pimplea in Pieria (Thrace). It depends on how we interpret *Pierios*, "of Mount Pieria" or "of the Muses". According to *ThLL* 7.2.862.42, *Pierii lacus* denotes the Hippocrene spring.

The use of *lacus* for *fons* is exceptional; it is only attested in Prop. 3.3.32, *Gorgoneo* . . . *lacu* (= Hippocrene spring) and Stat. *Theb.* 8.175–176, *lacus* . . . *Castalii*; and perhaps also in Ov. *Met.* 15.320 *Aethiopes lacus* (a spring, according to Bömer 339 *ad loc.*) and Plin. *Nat.* 31.16, *Clitorius lacus* (= *Clitorius fons* in Ov. *Met.* 15.322, the fountain of Clitor in Arcadia). For other poetic terms for *fons*, cf. also [Verg.] *Cul.* 18, *Pierii laticis decus*.

17: it is most unusual that the task of carrying the gift should be entrusted to the Muses themselves. Lygdamus issues orders and instructions as if they were simple message girls. To quote G. Lieberg ("Le muse in Tibullo e nel *Corp. Tib.*", *Prometheus* 6 [1980] 139), «evidentemente Ligdamo pensa che l'intervento delle Muse sarà la maniera più efficace per propiziare l'animo di Neera. Se essa è sensibile alla poesia, cederà certamente di fronte alla presenza affascinante delle divinità del canto»; later he adds: «affidando alle Muse detto

massagio, Ligdamo può sperare di essere esaudito da un cuore sensibile, come egli crede, al richiamo della poesia, richiamo che sarà più efficace se fatto valere dalle divinità stesse del canto (p. 142)».

ite domum: "go home / go to the house of . . .", an ambiguous formula which is only clarified by the *illi* (= *Neaerae*) of the following clause. Careless syntax (cf. 2.1–2, *qui primus caram* [scil. *puellam*] *iuveni carumque puellae / eripuit iuvenem*) or a deliberately homely expression?

cultumque . . . libellum: cf. Catul. 1.1, *lepidum novum libellum*; Lygd. 1.14 *comptum . . . opus* (comm.); Mart. 8.72.1; 11.1.1–2, *liber . . . / cultus*; for the opposite, cf. Ov. *Tr.* 1.1.3, *incultus* (*libellus*) = *inornatus*.

donate: "give [as a present]", a more exact and elegant verb than the simple *date*; cf. *donetur* (l. 5) and *donate* (l. 21).

18: Lygdamus here expands upon the order he gave to the Muses in the preceding line: the gift-book must reach Neaera's hands undamaged and in the very same state it was handed over to them. This is therefore a warning to the messenger-Muses against any possible damage or mishap the gift-book might suffer in transport. *Sicut erit* refers to *sic . . . comptum* (l. 14) and therefore to the previous detailed description of the process of embellishing the book (*ornamenta*). The future tense in the expression (*erit*), extremely awkward at first sight, alongside the set formula *sicut erat*, has prompted some editors (Statius, Voss, Bach) to make the completely unnecessary correction *erat*. *Erit* is justified by the simple fact that, in the fictitious chronological framework of the poem, the process of embellishing the *libellum* has not yet been brought about when Lygdamus asks the Muses to act as messengers: "go to her house and present her with the de luxe little edition, just as it was handed to you: let there be no change in any of its colours".

defluat: *defluere* is normally used of liquids (*aqua*, *mare*, *fluvius*, *aliqui liquores*) in the sense of "to flow, pour down"; cf. *ThLL* 5.1 362.55 ff.; here it is used in the figurative sense of "to get lost, disappear, vanish" (= *evanescere*); cf. Plin. *Nat.* 13.7, *celerrime is* (scil. *odor*) *evanescit atque defluit*. Another example of *defluere* with an equivalent meaning to *evanescere* is Lygd. 4.81, *defluxit corpore somnus*.

color: an intentionally ambiguous word which could equally refer to the *ornamenta* of the book in general or specifically allude to the pale colours, *luteum* and *niveum*, of l. 9 and thereby to all their erotic symbolism: yellow, colour of conjugal love, in that it is the colour of the marriage veil, and white, the shade corresponding to the paleness of the face, the real sign of *signum amoris* among the elegiac

poets, for whom a pale face is at the same time a symptom of love and proof of fidelity (cf. Prop. 1.18.17, *an quia parva damus mutato signa colore, / et non ulla meo clamat in ore fides*; cf. also Pichon, p. 224 s.v. *pallor* and p. 106 s.v. *color* <*abire*>, or the insistent *pallet* of the caustic epigram in Mart. 1.77). For this reason the Muses advised Lygdamus to adorn his gift-book with these very shades of yellow and white, which establish a symbolic connection with the message of *amor, fides aeterna et coniugium* contained in the final part of the elegy. It should be observed, however, that Lygdamus here is continuing to play with the personification of the book which we noted in ll. 10 and 14: if there the book was given a haircut and a good tidying-up, it is now capable of changing colour like a person's face. *Nullus defluat... color* is, at first sight, an equivalent expression to *ne palleat*, just as in Ov. *Ars* 2.450 *colorque fugit* is equivalent to the *palleat* of l. 446. However, Lygdamus here has cleverly varied the usual meaning of the expression, so that it means "*pallor ne fugiat*", since the colour he does not want the book to lose is precisely its whiteness, its *signum amoris* which he wishes to transmit to Neaera.

19–20: a hotly-debated distich. Although the content seems clear—Lygdamus is waiting for news about whether Neaera has forgotten him completely or still holds the same affection for him as she used to (or less)—the form of the hexameter as transmitted is not so clear: a) in the first half of the hexameter, the sudden appearance of the third person (*illa* [scil. *Neaera*] *mihi referet* [or *referat*]), transmitted by all of the mss., is quite shocking in a context that is overwhelmingly dominated by the second person (*ite... donate... donate... dicite*) and forces this distich to be taken as an aside. Besides, *referre* in the sense of "to respond" is normally applied to oral language, something that the poet cannot be so sure Neaera will do (*referet*), or categorically order her to do (*referat*). All of this suggests a more than likely corruption of the text, the conjecture *illa mihi referte* proposed by O. Skutsch being quite plausible (*Philologus* 110 [1966] 144 n. 1; 113 [1969] 156; cf. Ov. *Tr.* 4.3.10, *referte mihi*; *pace* H. Tränkle 79–80; *ZPE* 35 [1979] 21 ff. [*illa mihi referat*]), since it not only links up formally with the 2nd person plural imperative which is dominant in the whole passage, but is also perfectly consistent with the way Lygdamus treats the Muses as simple message girls who are also to act as intermediaries or mediators. The emendation *ille* (= *libellum*) for *illa* suggested by Helm (review of the ed. by Levy in *Philol. Woch.* 47 [1927] col. 1391) scarcely warrants consideration. *Illa* in place of

the expected *illud* can be explained both on metrical grounds and by the triple indirect question it announces; b) In the 2nd half of the hexameter, the disjunctive indirect question presents two irregularities, namely: 1) the sudden change of verbal mood (*est* . . . *deciderim*), a not absolutely serious anomaly, since it is amply attested in Propertius (cf. 2.16.39; 30.29; 34.34; 3.5.26; H. Tränkle, "Die Sprache des Properz und die stilistischen Tendenzen der augustischen Dichtung", *Bimillenario della morte di Properzio*, Assisi 1986, 168) and in Valerius Flaccus (with Langen *ad* 1.281); 2) the combination *si* . . . *an* . . . *an*, where the *si*, *pace* Axelson (*Eranos* 58 [1960] 293), is extremely suspicious—as observed by Muretus ("si pro an more graeco")—since disjunctive indirect questions with *si* . . . *an*, with the exception of Cels. *praef.* 36; 3.18.22; 3.21.8, are only attested in late Latin, from the time of the bishops Lucifer Calaritanus (end 4th c. AD; eg *Parc.* 19 p. 251.26) and Gregory of Tours (end 6th c. AD; eg *Franc.* 6.22; 9.38, *ut cognoscamus si vera sunt an falsa*). On disjunctive indirect questions in Latin, cf. F. Marx, "Die Beziehungen des Altlateins zum Spätlatein", *NJb* 23 (1909) 445–446; E. Betelli, "Il *si* interrogativo e disgiuntivo in latino", *Athenaeum* 2 (1924) 143–145; Kühner-Stegmann II.2.524; Hofmann-Szantyr 544–547 (§ 296), esp. for *si-an* p. 546 (§ 296 III e); Ernout-Thomas 318 (§ 320); Bassols II.179–180 (§ 183). Both anomalies can easily be resolved if we permit the simple emendation proposed by Lee (*PCPhS* 5 [1958/59] 21), *sit nostri mutua cura*; we thereby restore the subjunctive called for in any indirect question, getting rid at the same time of the inconvenient *si*. The absence of a particle in the first member of the disjunctive question is normal in all periods of Latin (see bibliography above).

As regards the pentameter, Pontanus proposed changing *an minor* to *an maneam* (thus in G), followed only by Baehrens; Heinsius suggested *anne amer*. Given that the dilemma is clearly established between two possibilities: whether she loves me or not, and that within the first possibility two degrees are considered: whether she loves me as intensely as I love her or less intensely, Ayrmann (*Vita Tibulli* § 86) emended the *an* which begins the pentameter to *aut*. Finally, Ach. Statius proposed to emend the second *an* to *et*. The categorizing of love into three degrees has always drawn the attention of the commentators: Heyne (p. 193) described it as *ludicrum*, Axelson ("Geburtsjahr", p. 293) as "etwas pedantisch".

19 sit nostri mutua cura: for the formulation, cf. [Tib.] 3.11.6, *si tibi de nobis mutuus ignis adest*; Ov. *Fasti* 2.64, *sit superis* . . . *mutua cura*

tui; and Mart. 10.13(20).9, *si tibi mens eadem, si nostri mutua cura est*. This last passage is quoted by many editors in favour of the reading *si nostri mutua cura est* transmitted in the mss. of Tibullus, but in Martial it is an absolutely correct conditional clause. Axelson ("Geburtsjahr", p. 293) has no hesitation in attributing the anomalies in Lygdamus to the poet's awkward imitation and adaption of this passage of Martial (cf. Büchner, "Lygdamus", pp. 98–99).

The expression *mutua cura* ("reciprocated love"), a typically Ovidian expression (cf. Ov. *Met.* 7.800; *Fasti* 2.64; 730; cf. also [Albinov.] *Liv.* 302; Rutil.-Nam. 1.588 p. 5; Schumann III, p. 483) is an allusion to the well-known erotic motif of the ἴσος Ἔρως, a motif F. Leo (*Plautinische Forschungen. Bln.* 1912², p. 145) derives, in its different variants, from New Comedy, and one amply attested in Roman literature in general, particularly in Ovid; cf. Ter. *Eun.* 91; Catul. 76.23; Hor. *Od.* 3.9.13–14 *me torret face mutua . . . Calais*; Tib. 1.2.65 (63); Tib. 1.6.14, (*livor*) *quem facit impresso mutua dente venus*; 76, *mutuus . . . amor*; [Tib.] 3.11.6–7, *mutuus ignis . . . mutuus . . . amor*, and 13–14; 12.8, *mutua vincla*; Ov. *Am.* 1.10.33; *Her.* 10.5, *urimur igne pari*; 15.163–164, *quoniam non ignibus aequis ureris*; 19.5, *urimur igne pari*; *Met.* 4.62; 192, *amore pari*; 7.800, *mutua cura duos et amor socialis habebat*, and 803, *aequales urebant pectora flammae* (with Bömer 393–394); 9.720; 14.24; Sen. *Phaed.* 416; *Octavia* 49–50, *odio pari ardens mariti mutua flagrat face*; *Anth. Lat.* 448.2, *mutuus ignis*; Kost 160–161 *ad* Musae. 18.

The poetic use of *cura* = *amor* appears as early as Plautus (cf. Pl. *Epid.* 135, *illam amabam olim; nunc iam alia cura impendet pectori*) and is later found in Catullus, Virgil, Horace and frequently in the elegists (the elegiac use may date back to Gallus (cf. Lygd. 6.29 [comm.]). In the *sermo amatorius*, the term *cura* sometimes signifies love as affection and concern for the beloved (cf. Prop. 1.8.1; 11.5; 15.31; 2.12.4; 3.21.3; Ov. *Am.* 1.9.43; 2.16.47; *Her.* 7.34; 8.15; 14.123; 16.198; 20.59; *Poet.* 1.301; 2.295; 331; 357; *Rem.* 205; 311; 484), sometimes as pain and suffering (cf. Catul. 2.10, *tristis animi levare curas*; 64.62; 72, *spinosas Erycina serens in pectore curas*; 95; 250; 68.18; 51; Verg. *Aen.* 4.1; Hor. *Ars* 85, *iuvenum curas . . . referre*; Tib. 1.5.37; 2.3.13; 6.51; Prop. 1.3.46; 5.10; 10.17; 18.23; 2.18.21; 3.17.4; Ov. *Am.* 2.10.12; 19.43; *Ars* 1.238; 240; 736; *Rem.* 69; 241; 259; 809; Lygd. 2.29; 6.7; 37) and at other times, by metonymy from Virgil on, *cura* is the actual beloved, the object of the lover's anxiety and concern (cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 10.22, *tua cura, Lycoris*; Tib. 2.3.31; [Tib.] 3.18.1; Prop. 1.1.35–36, *sua quemque moretur / cura*; 2.25.1; 34.9; Ov. *Am.* 1.3.16; 3.9.32; *Her.* 15.96; *Ars*

1.512; 555; 2.350; *Fasti* 5.525; Gudeman *ThLL* 4.1475.42 ff.; the Greek μέλεμα has an analogous meaning; cf. Ar. *Ec.* 972, ὦ χρυσοδαίδαλτον ἐμὸν μέλεμα; Men. *Pc.* 214, οὗ τὸ μέλεμ' ἐστ', ἐνθάδε). For the various elegiac senses of *cura*, see Pichon, p. 120; *OLD cura* 5; *ThLL* 4.1475.42 ff.

The Ovidian phrase *mutua cura* is thus a poetic variant on the Ciceronian *mutuus amor* (cf. Cic. *Ep.* 12.17.3; 13.50.1, *summus inter nos amor et mutuus*), also attested in poetry (cf. [Verg.] *Catal.* 4.12; Hor. *Epod.* 15.10; Tib. 1.2.65 [63]; 6.76; [Tib.] 3.11.7; *amore pari* in Ov. *Met.* 4.192); other poetic variants are undoubtedly *mutuus ignis*, *ignis aequuus*, *mutua flammma*, *mutua fax*, *mutua vincla*, etc. (cf. *loci supra cit.*). **20 toto pectore deciderim:** the metaphor "to fall from the heart" in place of the prosaic equivalent for "forget" appears as early as Hom. *Il.* 23.595, ἐκ θυμοῦ πεσέειν. *Decidere pectore* is an unusual variant on the more common Latin formula *excidere animo* or simply *excidere*; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.25–26, *necdum etiam causae irarum saevique dolores / exciderant animo*; [Verg.] *Aetna* 584, *excidit . . . tibi . . . candida . . . praemittere vela*; Ov. *Her.* 2.105, *utque tibi excidimus, nullam puto Phyllida nosti*; 12.71, *noscis? an exciderunt mecum loca?*; 20.190, *exciderant animo foedera lecta tuo*; *Met.* 14.139, *excidit, ut peterem . . .*; *Tr.* 1.5.13–14, *quam subeant animo meritorum oblivia nostro / et longa pietas excidat ista die*; *Ponto* 2.4.23–24, *non ego . . . excidere haec* (scil. "signa amoris mutui") *credam* **pectore** *posse tuo*; *Fasti* 5.315, *excidit officium tristi mihi*; Sen. *Med.* 559–561, *discessit. itan' est? vadis oblitus mei, / et tot meorum facinorum? excidimus tibi? / nunquam excidemus*; Mart. 1.96.14, *quaeris quis hic sit? excidit mihi nomen.* This use of *excidere* is equally attested among the prose-writers; cf. Cic. *Fam.* 5.13, *quae cogitatio cum mihi non omnino excidisset*; *Att.* 9.5.3; Liv. 22.15.6; 29.19.13, *Carthaginem atque Hannibalem excidisse de memoria*; 34.37.6, *exciderat pacis mentio ex omnium animis*; Tac. *Hist.* 2.76; Sen. *Contr.* 2.2.11; Quint. *Inst.* 2.3.10; 11.13.130; cf. *OLD excido* 9b; *ThLL* 5.2 1239.39–51. The choice of *deciderim* in preference to the expected *exciderim* is for obvious metrical reasons (it avoids synaloepha), as is adroitly pointed out by Tränkle 80 ("Die Wahl von *decidere* beruht wohl auf metrischen Gründen") and reiterated by Luck in his review of Tränkle, *GGA* 246 (1994) 76: "*toto pectore decidere* statt *excidere* sei metrisch bedingt". The choice of *pectore* is based on poetic considerations (cf. Ov. *Ponto* 2.4.23–24 *sup. cit.*). Variants on the formula *excidere animo*, as was pointed out by Broukhusius 293–294 *ad loc.*, are numerous: *descendere ex animo*, cf. Cic. *Somnium Sc.* 1; *effluere ex animo*, an image which appears among the Greeks (cf. S. *Ai.* 523, ἀπορρεῖ μνῆστις), cf. Cic.

Verr. 4.26; *Fin.* 1.12; *Fam.* 7.14; Catul. 65.18; *defluere ex animo*, cf. Prop. 1.20.2 (cf. Sen. *Ben.* 1.1.8, *illa cito defluant, has tenax memoria custodia*); *perfluere ex animo*, cf. Lucr. 3.954; *labi pectore*, cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 1.63; *abolere*, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.721; *delere*, cf. Ter. *Eun.* 2.3.4; *mutari sub pectore*, cf. Prop. 1.15.33; *emigrare*, cf. [Verg.] *Dir.* 101, *dulcia amara prius fient... quam tua de nostris emigret cura medullis*; also *corde exire* (cf. Stat. *Silv.* 4.4.102); *corde recedere* (cf. Stat. *Silv.* 3.5.55). Lygdamus, however, is innovative in that he reinforces the hackneyed expression by means of the emphatic *totus*, an affectionate use with an unmistakable Catullian ring to it (cf. Catul. 64.69–70, *illa* [scil. *Ariadna*] *vicem curans toto ex te pectore, Theseu, / toto animo, tota pendebat perdita mente*; 66.24–25, *ut tibi tunc toto pectore sollicitae / sensibus ereptis mens excidit!*; 68.25–26, *tota de mente fugavi / haec studia atque omnes delicias animi*; 76.22, *expulit ex omni pectore laetitias*) and an Ovidian stamp also; cf. Ov. *Ars* 3.56, *e toto pectore cessit onus* (with *toto pectore* in the same place in the pentameter); *Met.* 1.495 (with Bömer 156); 9.44; 244; 10.443; another 4 times in the *Fasti* (eg 6.509, *o toto pectore captae!*); for the analogous use of the expression *tota mente*, cf. Bömer 292 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 5.275, *nondum tota me mente recepi.*

21–22: strikingly similar to the content of this distich are the instructions sent by Statius, together with a letter, to Victorius Marcellus in *Silv.* 4.4.10–11, *cui primum solito vulgi de more salutem, / mox inclusa modis haec reddere verba memento.* Martial, too, sent greetings and a request to his friend Parthenius via a Muse; cf. Mart. 12.11.1, *Parthenio dic, Musa, tuo nostroque salutem* (*tradat ut ipse duci carmina nostra roga*, l. 6). Cf. introduction into commentary of this poem.

21: the *referte* of the previous distich implies a twofold order from Lygdamus to the Muses: firstly, they should ascertain how intense is the affection Neaera feels towards him, and secondly they are to return straight to him, once they have carried out their task, and give him a full report. The expression *sed primum* (l. 21) restores the instructions it presents to their chronological order—previous to the orders contained in the previous distich—while it underlines the need for a strategy to be followed to make Neaera well-disposed to giving a positive reply: before trying to ascertain the degree of intensity of her affection, the Muses must first manage to put across, with all sorts of kindly and attentive gestures (21–22), the passionate love felt for her by Lygdamus and his unswerving *fides* (23–28). There can be no doubt that Lygdamus has not switched the chronological order out of a lack of skill, but rather in the knowledge that the climax of

the elegy required the culminating reference to his death and his epitaph.

larga donate salute: a solemn variant on the ordinary *plurimam* (or *multam*) *salutem dicere* (frequent in letter-headings; cf. v. gr. Pl. *Poen.* 406, *Veneri dicito multam meis verbis salutem*; Mart. 12.11.1 *sup. cit.*; Amm. 17.5.3, *Constantio salutem plurimam dico*; *OLD salus* 8a; *ThLL* 5.1.979.6–20. Another variation is *alicui multam salutem impertire*; cf. Pl. *Ps.* 43, *amatori suo . . . salutem impertit*; Cic. *Att.* 2.12.4, *impertit tibi multam salutem.* The identical line-ending (*larga donate salute/*) is to be found in Lucr. 5.1215. It is interesting to observe the different use Lygdamus makes of the verb *donare* in ll. 5, 17 and 21; whereas in l. 17 he follows the formula *donare alicui aliquod*, in which the meaning of *donare* is "to give as a present", in l. 21 he uses the formula *donare aliquem aliquo*, where *donare* takes on the meaning of "to honour someone with something, to fête, reward someone", as in the expression *donare aliquem civitate.* In l. 5, however, the latter scheme is followed, even if the two meanings are superimposed, deliberately helped by the ambiguity of the impersonal passive form and the festive context surrounding the idea of giving a present (ll. 1–4). The meaning of *donare* here is that of "giving a present which honours, rewarding with a gift". Note in the same line the structure *quonam donetur honore*, where we might rather expect *quod munus donem* (or *dem*), and *ut digna est* (l. 8), which ties in with the idea of the gift as a reward which Neaera has proved she deserves, as in *meritam* in l. 21. This change of construction as well as of meaning that *donare* undergoes in ll. 17 and 21, together with the striking ellipsis of the person being referred to by *meritam* (scil. *illam*, l. 21), explain the lack of agreement in the manuscript tradition concerning *meritam* (*meritum, myrtum, nuntium, nympham*): the phrase has not been understood, and a clear direct object has been sought for *donate*, the preferred variant being *nympham*, a Hellenism for *nuptam*, all supported by the allusion to *coniugium* in the following lines (Muretus, Ach. Statius, Scaliger, Vulpius, Wunderlich, Huschke, De Golbéry). Given the festive nature of the *Matronalia*, G. Wijdeveld (*Mnemosyne* 11 [1942–1943] 79–80) defends the reading *myrtum*, the tree of Venus which Lygdamus sends as a *strena* or present given on feast-days as a sign of good luck and which, according to Deubneri (*Glotta* 3 [1912] 43 ff.) consisted of branches of trees of good omen.

The construction *larga . . . salute* is unusual; the adjective *larga* is to be taken here as affecting *salute* as regards quantity or quality ("affectionate, effusive greeting") and not the duration of the

greeting. The choice may be determined by its affinity with *largior*, a denominative verb from *largus*, which, if this is so, adds to *donate* a double dimension of generosity and bribery-corruption. It should not be forgotten that Lygdamus' desire is to win reconciliation with Neaera by sending her a luxury gift. The unusual nature of the construction explains why some editors (Scaliger, Broukhusius, Huschke, Lachmann, Dissen) defend the reading *longa . . . salute* of some manuscripts (Wittianus, Datanus, Askewianus), citing Verg. *Ecl.* 3.79, *et longum formose vale, vale, inquit Iola.*

22 submisso . . . sono: "in a low voice, quietly", that is, the humble tone of voice appropriate in a supplicant. According to Vulpius the ancients used to formulate their prayers to the gods "timidissimo tenuique murmure"; cf. Catul. 64.103–104, *non ingrata tamen frustra munuscula divis / promittens* (scil. *Ariadna*) *tacito succepit vota labello* (cf. also Lygd. 3.33, *timidis . . . votis*); Vulpius consequently concludes that Lygdamus orders the Muses to talk to Neaera of his desire for marriage "submissa voce . . . tamquam deae". Without going so far, it can, however, be said that Lygdamus here is urgently recommending the Muses to adopt the humble tone of voice of a supplicant and those who, finding themselves in an inferior position, try to win some concession from their interlocutors, who are not necessarily gods. There are no exact parallels for the expression; cf., however, *submissa voce* ("in a low voice, quietly") in Cic. *Flac.* 66, *submissa voce agam tantum ut iudices audiant*; Sen. *Contr.* 1.1.8; [Verg.] *Cir.* 355, *submissis vocibus* (with Lyne 253); *Lydia* 6; Ov. *Met.* 7.90, *auxilium submissa voce rogavit* (≈ *Ponto* 4.3.41–42); [Albinov.] *Liv.* 289; Mart. 8.75.11, *submissa voce precatur*; cf. also Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.45, *ne dicamus omnia clamose . . . aut submisso murmure*; *OLD submissus* 3.

23–28: message from Lygdamus which the Muses are to transmit word-for-word to Neaera.

23–24: beginning of the message, functioning as a kind of visiting card to accompany the gift. The donor (Lygdamus) identifies himself by means of a periphrasis—*tibi vir quondam, nunc frater*—which would undoubtedly be perfectly clear for the recipient (Neaera). Modern readers, however, do not know who is being referred to until we read his name in 2.29.

23 haec: has to be taken together with *munera parva*. The anticipation with respect to its syntagma is justified by its strong deictic content, almost equivalent to that of *ecce*; and undoubtedly the moment it was

uttered, it would be accompanied by the gesture of offering the gift-book.

vir quondam, nunc frater: note the chiastic AabB construction, with the nouns at the ends and the adverbs in the middle, and the corresponding internal opposition. It is not true, as Tränkle 80–81 claims, that this expression is answered to in the antithesis of l. 26, *sive sibi coniunx sive futura soror*, at least not on the temporal level; for whereas in l. 23 the temporal past/present antithesis implies a change in the status of Lygdamus (*vir/frater*), in l. 26 the *coniunx/soror* antithesis works as a sort of double possibility for the future, and it is only as a result of a comparison between the two lines that the antithesis *soror* (*nunc*)/*potius coniunx* (*futurum*) can be deduced: Lygdamus was *vir* of Neaera and is now her *frater*—and she correspondingly his *soror*; and for the future a further change is desired, but the other way round.

Vir and *frater* (l. 23), in conjunction with the parallel terms *coniunx* and *soror* (l. 26), have given scholars much to think about in connection with the type of relationship that held between Lygdamus and Neaera. Muretus himself observed the difficulty involved in these terms, and judged Lygdamus—in his view a fictitious name hiding the identity of Tibullus—and Neaera to be «fratrum aut sororum filios», and he adds: «Notum est autem, et eos, qui fratribus sororibusve editi sint, fratres vocari; et inter eos olim et legitimas et usitatas fuisse nuptias. Hanc igitur sororem suam videtur Tibullus aliquandiu in matrimonio habuisse: deinde casu aliquo intervenisse discessio. Sperabat autem Tibullus, nuptias denuo conglutinatum iri, idque toto pectore cupiebat. Hoc probabilius afferre nunc quidem nihil possum (pp. 97–98)»; that is, Lygdamus was a first cousin of Neaera. In the opinion of Lipsius and Ach. Statius (p. 200) *quondam* here contains some future notion and they take *frater* to be a synonym of *moechus* or *amicus*: "he who will one day be your husband, but is as yet your lover". Broukhusius (p. 295) refutes this interpretation, arguing on the grounds of the incompatibility of *casta* (l. 23) with the theory of a relationship between lovers, and defends a *quondam* with a past sense and in the present a chaste, loving relationship, comparable to that between a brother and a sister. However, Vulpius (p. 217), taking up the interpretation of Lipsius and Ach. Statius, refutes this objection, arguing that *casta* is not to be taken strictly here, but "quae, ceteris amatoribus exclusis, uni sibi noctis copiam facit" (cf. Tib. 1.6.67–68; 75–76; 1.3.83); he consequently interprets *quondam* in the sense of *futurus* or *destinatus*, and *frater* as *concubinatus*, in accordance with the ancient custom of

covering up something shameful under an honourable name. For his part, Heyne (p. 193) also declares himself in favour of the most sensible hypothesis and one in accordance with elegiac fiction: «aliquando coniunx futurus, nunc amator». For the division of opinion between modern critics, grouped around three different suppositions (husbands, lovers, betrothed), see Ch. II of the introduction, devoted to the thorny subject of the nature of the relationship between Lygdamus and Neaera.

As regards the formulation, cf. Prop. 2.28C.61, *Divae nunc, ante iuvencae*. For the *quondam/nunc* antithesis indicating a change in fortune, cf. also Tib. 1.8.71–76, *hic Marathus quondam miseros ludebat amantes, / [. . .] / nunc omnes odit fastus, nunc . . .*

casta Neaera: the adjective *castus* applied to Neaera again stresses the very elegiac fiction, though one particularly pleasing to Lygdamus, of assimilating a relationship of free love to that of marriage; in fact, *casta* in connection with the woman, apart from describing her as "virgin" before marriage, presents her as *fida* once married, that is, a rigid observer of conjugal fidelity (*matrona univira*); in short, 'chastity' is the principal virtue to be pursued by the woman throughout her life (first as *virgo*, then as *matrona*) and the greatest praise that she can hope to leave in the memory of those who survive her, apart from that of being hardworking in the home, as shown in the famous funerary motif *domum servavit, lanam fecit* (*CLE* 52.8); cf. Mart. 1.13.1, *casta . . . Arria* (with Howell 138): because of her determination to follow her husband even to the tomb, Arria is an *exemplum* of the Roman ideal of the *univira*, the ideal with which Dido was obsessed (on this point G. M. Nisbet, *JRS* 68 [1968] 4, quotes M. Humbert, *Le Remariage à Rome* [1972] and *Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum* 3.1017–1018). The *castae puellae* bewail the death of Oppia, Arria and Laodamia, examples of supreme chastity, in an inscription dating from shortly after Trajan found in Anagnia (*ILS* 6261 = *CLE* 423). For *casta*, "keeping away from other men" (= *fida*), both in and outside marriage, cf. eg Verg. *Aen.* 8.665; Tib. 1.3.83; 6.67; 75; Prop. 1.11.29; 3.12.15; Ov. *Am.* 3.4.3; *Met.* 2.544; Pichon, p. 101; *ThLL* 3.565.15 ff.

24 accipias . . . rogat: paratactical subordination of the type "*venias volo*". The subjunctive mood is sufficient to mark the dependence, with no need for an explicit *ut.* This construction is attested with *rogo* from Cicero and Caesar; cf. Kühner-Stegmann II.2.173; Hofmann-Szantyr 528 ff. (§ 289), esp. § 289 I.i; Ernout-Thomas 300 (§ 307); Bassols II.128 (§ 136); on the colloquial nature of this paratactical

construction, cf. Hofmann, *Latín familiar*, pp. 159–162 (§ 100).

munera parva: equivalent to *munusculum*, "a little gift"; diminutive of modesty or endearment, like *libellum* (l. 9 n.). For hypocoristic diminutives, belonging in part to elevated style, in part to the language of lovers and children, cf. Hofmann, *Latín familiar*, pp. 132–133 (§ 82a). The expression is first attested in Ov. *Ars* 2.256, *porrige Fortunae munera parva die/* (in the same place in the pentameter, its usual metrical position), and then in Paneg. Mess. 7, *est nobis voluisse satis, nec munera parva / respueris*, and it enjoys some measure of favour in late Antiquity; cf. Dracont. *Romul.* 9.215 p. 179, *munere parvo/*; Fort. *Carm.* 1.17.1 p. 21; 8.6.4 p. 193; Alcuin. *Carm.* 42.12 p. 254; *MGH Poet.* 5 p. 427 nr. 7.3; Schumann III, p. 467.

25–28: a message of total love, undying *fides* and the desire to contract matrimony.

25: emphatic expression of total love; cf. Maecen. fr. 3.1–2 M., *ni te visceribus meis, Horati, plus iam diligo*. Normally the term of comparison is life itself or the individual himself, or else a loved one; cf. Cic. *Sull.* 88, *puero, qui ei est vita sua multo carior, metuit*; *Cat.* 1.27, (*patria*) *mihi vita mea multo est carior*; *Fam.* 14.7.1, *Tulliolam quae nobis nostra vita dulcior est*; Catul. 58.2–3, *illa Lesbia, quam Catullus unam / plus quam se atque suos amavit omnes*; 64.215, *gnate mihi longa iocundior unice vita* (with Fordyce 303); 65.10, *vita frater amabilior*; 68.106–107, *vita dulcius atque anima / coniugium*; 159, *et longe ante omnes mihi quae me carior ipso est*; Verg. *Aen.* 5.724–725, *nate, mihi vita quondam, dum vita manebat, / care magis*; [Verg.] *Cul.* 212, *tua dum mihi carior ipsa vita fuit vita*; Ov. *Tr.* 5.14.2, *o mihi me coniunx carior*; *Ponto* 2.8.27, *patriae nomen quae te tibi carior ipso est*; Luc. *Civ.* 5.739–740 (Pompey to Cornelia), *ille gemes "non nunc vita mihi dulcior", inquit / "cum taedet vitae, laeto sed tempore, coniunx"*; Sen. *Dial.* 11.7.4, *cariorem tibi spiritu tuo Caesarem esse*; Mart. 11.20.7, *vita carior . . . mentula* (with Kay 113: "a humorous adaptation of a common idiom"). The most frequent term of comparison in such hyperbolic expressions of affection in connection with the human body is not one's "innermost being", but the eyes; cf. Pl. *Mil.* 984; Ter. *Ad.* 903; Catul. 3.5 (with Fordyce 93); 14.1; 82 *passim*, where Catullus plays with the formula; 104.2, *ambobus mihi quae carior est oculis*; cf., for Gr., Call. *Dian.* 211, Ἀντίλειαν ἴσον φαέεσσι φιλῆσαι; Mosch. 4.9, τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ τίεσκον ἴσον φαέεσσιν ἐμοῖσιν. For other emphatic expressions of affection in Lygd. using formulas of comparison, cf. 4.51–52 (comm.). On ἀφροδίτιος ὅρκος see Lygd. 6.49b–50 (comm.).

As regards the formulation, the infinitive construction is the usual

one for clauses introduced by verbs meaning "to swear"; the *ut* construction with this type of verb is not very common. The use of the periphrastic idiom *caram magis* to express the comparative degree of the adjective in place of the simple suffix (*cariorem*) is explained here by metrical considerations.

26–27a: a long expression in the vocative which embodies Lygdamus' generous feeling of faithful love for Neaera, whatever the degree of intimacy might be in the future. For *sive . . . sive . . . sed potius*, note a similar construction, both in [Tib.] 3.11.13–15, *vel serviat aeque / vinctus uterque tibi, vel mea vincla leva. / Sed potius . . .*, and in Ov. *Met.* 9.598–99, *nonne vel illa dies fuerat vel tota voluntas, / sed potius mutanda dies?* This is a variation on the rhetorical figure called 'correctio' (cf. Lausberg, *Retórica Literaria*, pp. 205–210 (§§ 784–786): Lygdamus has complicated the simplest formula "*non x, sed y*" by replacing the first element with a disjunction: "*vel x vel y, sed potius x*". The poet thus presses for his preference.

26 soror: scil. *concubina, amasia*; cf. Petr. *Satyr.* 127.1, *'si non fastidis' inquit 'feminam ornatam . . . concilio tibi, o iuvenis, sororem'*; Mart. 2.4.3, *fratrem te vocat et soror vocatur*; *OLD soror* 1d; there is a similar *coniunx/soror* opposition in Mart. 12.21, *quare non habeat, Fabulle, quaeris / uxorem Themison? habet sororem.* On the nature of the relationship between Lygdamus and Neaera, cf. Lygd. 1.23 (comm.) and Ch. II of the introduction, devoted specifically to this topic.

26–27 coniunx: the considerable frequency of this term in the poetry of Lygdamus—up to five times in as many lines (cf. also 2.4 and 30; 3.32), as opposed to only four in the genuine Tibullus and not one occurrence in the rest of the *Corp. Tib. III*—makes the term particularly relevant, especially if we bear in mind that, in contrast with the pre-eminence of the term *uxor* for "wife" in all periods, *coniunx* was always confined to elevated poetry, tragedy and epic, genres which (with the sole exception of Luc. *Civ.* 3.353) avoid the use of the everyday *uxor* altogether, as do the epitaphs, where for obvious reasons the more respectful and encomiastic term (*coniunx*) is preferred; and even if the two terms appear with similar frequency among the elegiac poets, it is equally true that the elegiac use of *coniunx* is limited in great measure to epic contexts. *Uxor*: Ov. 60 (*Met.* 0; *Fasti* 5); Verg. 1 (*Aen.* 0); Hor. 20 (*Od.* 7); Tib. 4 (1.9.54; 10.42; 52; 2.2.11); Prop. 7; Catul. 3; Lucr. 5; Sen. *Trag.* 3; Luc. 1; Val.-Flac. 0; Sil. 0; Stat. 3 (all in the prefaces to the *Silvae*); Mart. 62; Juv. 29; *coniunx*: Hor. 11 (*Od.* 8; *Ep.* 2.1.142; *Sat.* 2.5.31; 7.46); Verg. *Ecl.* 2 (8.18; 66),

Ge. 6, *Aen.* 63; Prop. 12 (1.15.15; 21; 19.7; 2.6.23; 8.29; 28A.3; 28C.48; 3.11.31; 12.16; 23; 22.42; 4.3.49); Tib. I–II: 4 (1.2.43; 4.74; 6.15; 33); Ov. *Met.* 125, *Fasti* 30, *Am.* 6 (1.10.2; 2.5.35; 12.25; 3.4.37; 5.16; 13.1), *Her.* 42, *Ars* 10 (1.302; 334; 2.6; 381; 574; 3.19; 111; 303; 391; 699), *Rem.* 7, *Tr.* 25; *Ponto* 16, *Ib.* 4, *Nux* 1.

On this question, see Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, p. 57–58; J. N. Adams, "Latin Words for 'Woman' and 'Wife' ", *Glotta* 50 (1972) 252–253 (especially pp. 249 ff.); Watson, *Axelson revisited*, pp. 431–432.

The preference shown by Lygdamus for *coniunx* as opposed to *uxor*, which does not appear in his poetry, can perhaps be attributed to the strong emotional and ecomiastic connotations which *coniunx* always had as a term of respect as compared with the more neutral *uxor* (cf. Adams, *art. cit.*, p. 252).

Note, moreover, that the other elegiac poets never apply this term to their respective beloved (preferring *puella*). Lygdamus might have taken this meaning of *coniunx* from the 8th *Eclogue* of Virgil, in which the goat-herds Damon and Alphesiboeus use the term *coniunx* to refer to their respective loved ones, Nysa and Daphnis, who, however, do not repay their love; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 8.18, *coniugis indigno Nysae deceptus amore*; 66–67 (Alphesiboeus assuming the persona of a *lena*), *coniugis ut magicis sanos avertere sacris / experiar sensus*); note, too, the influence of Verg. *Ecl.* 8.46–50 in Lygd. 4.65–66 (comm.). In addition, of the 7 times Lygdamus uses the elegiac term *puella* (2.1; 4.33; 52; 58; 6.12; 51; 60), only on three occasions does it refer to Neaera, once being placed in the mouth of Apollo, indicating the relationship with a man other than the poet (4.58, *alterius mavult esse puella viri*), and on the other two occasions actually being used by Lygdamus; curiously, however, this occurs in the elegy that is characterized as the one in which Lygdamus' feelings for Neaera are coldest, the elegy of the final *discidium*, where the term *puella* carries a strong element of insult (almost "bitch"), highlighted by the adjectives accompanying it (6.51, *fallacis . . . puellae*; 60, *vana puella*). For *coniunx* in the sense of *amica* or *amasia*, apart from the *loci Vergiliani* cited, cf. Prop. 2.8.29; Ov. *Her.* 2.103; Sen. *Ag.* 1002; *OLD coniunx* 1c; *ThLL* 4.343.53–56.

On the nature of the relationship between Lygdamus and Neaera, cf. Lygd. 1.23 (comm.) and Ch. II of the introduction, devoted specifically to this topic.

27 potius: Verg. 0; [Verg.] 10 (*Ciris* 8; *Copa* 1); Hor. 12; Tib. 4; [Tib.] 4; Lygd. 1; Prop. 3; Ov. 26; according to statistics by Bömer 454 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 9.599.

27b–28: his hope of becoming Neaera's husband will last as long as he lives, that is, he will only lose this hope when he loses his life. Lygdamus here is cleverly varying the well-known proverbial expression *dum spiro, spero* (cf. *Priap.* 80.9, *dum vivis, sperare decet*; there are copious *loci similes*, both Greek and Latin, in Otto, *Sprichwörter*, pp. 329–330 s.v. *sperare* 1). For another elegant variation, but in the sense of "he who has lost hope no longer lives", cf. Pl. *Bacch.* 369–370 (cf. Theocr. *Idyll.* 4.42, Ἐλπίδες ἐν ζωοῖσιν, ἀνέλπιστοι δὲ θανόντες).
27 huius spem nominis: ie *coniunx*. As pointed out by Vulpius 217, there may be some wordplay here, for the Romans called the betrothed woman not only *desponsata* or *pacta*, but also *sperata* (and the man *speratus*); cf. Pl. *Frg.* 10, *lubenter meam speratam consequor*; Ov. *Her.* 11.123, *tu tamen, o frustra miserae sperate sorori*; 21.61, *aut tibi iam nulla est speratae cura puellae*; Non. p. 706 Lindsay, *virgo, priusquam petitur, sperata dicitur . . . Dehinc promisa, dicta vel pacta vel sponsa dici potest*; Afran. 174; 176, *nuntia venire et mecum me speratum adducere*; Hyg. *Fab.* 33.2, *Hercules . . . centaurum interfecit, suam speratam* (scil. *Deianiram*) *abduxit*. For this nuptial sense of the verb *spero*, cf. Stat. *Ach.* 1.241, *et sperata diu plorant conubia nymphae* (= *nuptae*).
28: likely reference to Lethe, the underworld spring or river of Oblivion, from which the dead drank in order to forget their life in the upper world (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.714–715, *corpora debentur Lethaei ad fluminis undam / securos latices et longa oblivia potant*). As is only to be expected, Lethe becomes easily assimilated to death itself through the equivalence of "drinking the water of Lethe" = "dying" (cf. Catul. 65.5–6, *namque mei nuper Lethaeo gurgite fratris pallidulum manans alluit unda pedem*). Death, then, will not deprive Lygdamus of his *amor et fides aeterna* for Neaera, but rather it is Lethe that will delete the recollection from his memory. Here Lygdamus deliberately makes a connection with the idea of oblivion referred to in l. 20 (*an toto pectore deciderim*): Neaera may have forgotten him in life, but he will only forget her after drinking inexorably from the Spring of Forgetfulness after his death. The allusion to the Spring of Forgetfulness in connection with the cares of love and the idea of suicide (cf. Lygd. 2) appears earlier in Ps.–Theoc. 23.19–26a:

> Ἄγριε παῖ καὶ στυγνέ, κακᾶς ἀνάθρεμμα λεαίνας,
> λάινε παῖ καὶ ἔρωτος ἀνάξιε, δῶρά τοι ἦλθον
> λοίσθια ταῦτα φέρων, τὸν ἐμὸν βρόχον οὐκέτι πὰρ σὲ
> κῶρ' ἐθέλω λύπης κεχολωμένος, ἀλλὰ βαδίζω,
> ἔνθα τύ μευ κατέκρινας, ὅπη λόγος ἦμεν ἀταρπὸν

ξυνάν καὶ ἣν ὅλον αὐτὸ λαβὼν ποτὶ χεῖλος ἀμέλξω,
οὐδ' οὕτως σβέσσω τὸν ἐμὸν χόλον.

For the striking echoes of this idyll in the work of Lygdamus, cf. the commentary on Lyg. 2.29–30 (funerary epigram); 4.73–74 (*nescis quid sit Amor*) and 85–94 (topos of insensitivity).

The reference to Pseudo-Theocritus is more emphatic, since not even the waters of Oblivion will make him forget. Along the same lines is Ov. *Ponto* 2.4.23–24, *non ego, si biberes securae pocula Lethes, / excidere haec credam pectore posse tuo* (observe the non-accidental coincidence between Lygdamus and Ovid in the striking formula *excidere* or *decidere pectore*, "to forget"; cf. the commentary on this point in l. 20). In fact, "to drink from the waters of Lethe" (= "to forget") became a hackneyed proverbial expression (cf. Hor. *Epod.* 14.1–4; Ov. *Ars* 3.340, *nec mea Lethaeis scripta dabuntur aquis*; *Tr.* 1.8.36, *cunctane Lethaeis mersa feruntur aquis?*; 4.1.47, *utque soporiferae biberem si pocula Lethes*; *Ponto* 4.1.17, *da mihi . . . hebetantem pectora Lethen*; Luc. *Civ.* 5.221–222 [with Barratt 71]; 6.768–770; Hier. *Ruf.* 1.30; Symm. 1.91[85]; Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 192 s.v. *Lethe*). In Lygdamus the image of Lethe is used in its double sense of Death and Oblivion.

Moreover, it should be recalled that the water of Lethe as an erotic motif is also present in the well-known expression "the wounds of love can only be bathed in the waters of the underworld", that is, unrequited love can only be forgotten in death, the expression being reinforced by the equation: waters of the underworld = Lethe = oblivion. This image appears to date back to Euphorion (fr. 43 Powell [= fr. 47 van Groningen], Κώκυτος <τοι> μοῦνος ἀφ' ἕλκεα νίψεν Ἄδωνιν), from which it was probably borrowed by Gallus, who is perhaps cited by Propertius in 2.34.91–92, *Gallus / mortuus inferna vulnera* (scil. *amoris ad Lycoriden*) *lavit aqua* (with Enk 465), where again this image closes the elegy (and book II); cf. M. Rothstein, *Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius* (Berlin 1898) 375; H. Tränkle, *Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache* (Wiesbaden 1960) 22–25; Büchner, "Lygdamus", p. 68 and n. 1; M. Parca, "The position of Lygdamus in Augustan Poetry", *Stud. in Lat. Lit. & Rom. Hist.* 4 (Bruxelles 1986) 469–470.

Lygdamus appears to refer to the amnesic properties of the waters of Hell in 3.37–38 (with L. Lenaz, in A. La Penna [1989] 362).

pallida Ditis aqua: for the expression, cf. [Verg.] *Cul.* 333, *pallentesque lacus et squalida Tartara*; 372, *Ditis opacos . . . lacus*; Mart. 9.29.2, *infernas . . . Ditis aquas*; Homer. 723, *fluctus*; Stat. *Theb.* 7.782, *atra . . .*

Ditis flumina; Avien. *Arato* 210, *stagna nigrantia* (*ThLL Onom.* D 190.3–6).

pallida: "pale or making pale". The usual adjective for the water of Lethe is *soporifera* (cf. Ov. *Tr.* 4.1.47), but since *Ditis aqua* here is a periphrasis equivalent to *mors*, by contamination it can take the adjective *pallida*, as in Hor. *Od.* 1.4.13, *pallida Mors* (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.644, [*Dido*] *pallida morte futura*; Nisbet-Hubbard (*Od.* I 67) cite Sen. *Her. f.* 555; Hier. *Os.* 6.54). The adjective *pallidus*, strictly used—in principle—of the deathlike paleness of the corpses and shades that dwell in the underworld (cf. Tib. 1.10.38, *pallida turba*; Catul. 65.6, *mei . . . Lethaeo gurgite fratris pallidulum manans alluit unda pedem*; Verg. *Aen.* 4.26, *pallentis umbras Erebo*; 4.243, *hac* [scil. *virga*] *animas ille evocat Orco pallentis*), eventually becomes an epithet applicable to anything connected with the kingdom of Hades; cf. Enn. *Scen.* 109, *pallida Leti . . . loca*; Verg. *Ge.* 1.277, *pallidus Orcus*; *Aen.* 8.245, *regna . . . pallida*; Sen. *Herc. O.* 1012, *hic . . . pallens dira Tisiphone stetit*; *Phaed.* 1201, *pallidi fauces Averni*; Luc. *Civ.* 1.456, *Ditis . . . profundi pallida regna petunt*; Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.24, *pallentes . . . lucos*; *Theb.* 2.48, *pallentes . . . umbras*; cf. also Lygd. 5.21, *parcite pallentes undas quicumque tenetis*. The same procedure leads Horace to describe the abode of Pluto as "gaunt" (cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.4.17, *domus exilis Plutonia*).

28 Ditis: Ditis or Dis, "the Rich one", is the ritual Latin sobriquet, equivalent to the Greek Πλούτων (Pluto), of the god of the underworld, Hades (Ἅιδης), "the Invisible one", who reigns mercilessly over his subjects, the dead, whom he does not allow to return to the world of the living. Such was the fear he inspired among mortals that he is rarely mentioned by his name, which was considered taboo, since it was feared that his wrath would be provoked by doing so. Instead, he was referred to by means of euphemisms, the most common being Dis/Ditis or Pluto, in reference to the boundless riches of the earth, both the crops on its surface—he was originally a god of the land—and the mines hidden within it; for the proverbial wealth of Ditis, cf. Enn. *Scaen.* 245 (192 Jocelyn), *Mortis thesauri* (with Vahlen); Epitaph. Naev. *apud* Gell. 1.24.2 *FPL* p. 28 Morel 39–40 Buecheler, *Orchi . . . thesauro*; Ov. *Met.* 14.116–117, *Aeneas . . . formidabilis Orci / vidit opes* (with Bömer 51); Auson. 349.16 p. 168 Peiper. 137 Prete, *dives opum cur nomen habet Iove de Stygio Dis?*; Claud. *Pros.* 1.20–21; Macr. *Somn.* 1.11.2. The ancient writers always refer to this divinity by his complete title of *Dis Pater*; the poets, however, almost always simply as *Dis* (from Ennius); Ovid uses the term *Dis* only in *Met.* (cf. 4.438; 511; 5.384 [with Bömer 325]; 395; 569; 15.535) and *Fasti* (cf. 4.449);

in Lygdamus, again in 3.38. On *Dis Pater*, cf. Enn. *Var.* 78, *Pluto Latine est Dis pater, alii Orcum vocant*; Cic. *Nat.* 2.66, *Diti patri . . . qui dives, ut apud Graecos* Πλούτων; Peter en Roscher I, pp. 1179 ss.; Carter en Roscher III, pp. 3141 ss.; Wissowa, *RuK*², pp. 194, 309 ss.; K. Latte, *Römische religionsgeschichte*, München 1960, pp. 247 ss.; Walde-Hofmann, *LEW* I³, p. 355; Grimal, *Mitología*, p. 142 (s.v. Dis Pater), 220–221 (s.v. Hades) and 436 (s.v. Plutón); Altheim, *Terra Mater*, pp. 6 ss.; *OCD* 484 (s. v. Hades); Radke 108–109; *ThLL Onom.* D 189.5 ff.

II

The central theme of this second elegy is Lygdamus' open confession that he is weary of life, a veiled allusion to his looking forward to death, perhaps through suicide. The poet expands on this central thought inspiring the poem (ll. 7–8), first by mention of the background events leading irremediably to this unbearable weariness and malaise: a rival has taken his beloved Neaera from him (ll. 1–6); secondly, through a lengthy depiction of his own funeral, a vision in which the poet rejoices since, for that moment at least, he recovers the company and affection of his sorely-missed Neaera (ll. 9–30). Lygdamus not only sees death as the best means of escape from his anguish, but in his hands it becomes at the same time a supreme declaration to Neaera of all-embracing love and a most effective instrument of veiled threat and emotional blackmail.

Following on from the above, this elegy is structured into two clearly differentiated blocks pivoting on *ergo* (l. 9): A) the harsh, unbearable reality facing Lygdamus (present life: ll. 1–8); B) the longed-for and blissful funeral fantasy (future death: ll. 9–30); that is, the first section describes the loss of zest for life, brought about by the *discidium* from Neaera, the second the funeral ceremony in detail, as was pointed out by R. Bürger ("Studien zu Lygdamus und den Sulpiciagedichten", *Hermes* 40 [1905] 321).

The fantasy of death as the last resort to deal with the ills of the present is not an original idea of Lygdamus, since other masters of Roman love elegy, Propertius and Tibullus, had imagined themselves at their own funeral, surrounded by all the warmth, attention and displays of affection on the part of their beloved—a moment of bliss and contentment—of which they had been deprived completely in life; cf. Tib. 1.1.59–69; 3.5–8; Prop. 1.17; 19; 2.13.17 ff.; 3.16.23 ff. The Hellenistic model is undoubtedly Ps.-Theoc. 23.

As a means of escape from harsh reality and insensitive lovers, the elegists' fantasy about their own death is altogether comparable to another channel of escape that is no less frequent or elegiac in nature: the dream of a mythical Golden Age, the other side of the coin from the wretchedness and cruelty of the real world (Tib. 1.3.48 ff.; 10) and the *luxuria dominae* in particular (cf. Tib. 2.3; Prop. 3.13; Ov.

Am. 3.8). In both fantasies—death and *Aetas Aurea*—there lies the elegiac Bliss of dreaming and longing for the impossible; for the *Aetas Aurea,* cf. Navarro, *Amada codiciosa,* pp. 67–73 (≈ *Habis* 22 [1991] 219–220).

* * *

1–8: Lygdamus is not ashamed to confess that he neither has any desire to go on living nor feels capable of doing so in the absence of Neaera, now that she has been taken away from him. To emphasize this simple idea, Lygdamus makes use of the well-known rhetorico-poetical device of the priamel or *preambulum* (*alius/ego*), which shapes this first part of the elegy into two easily-recognizable and complementary halves: a) others may be able to put up with life and go on living after the loss of their beloved; this is the famous amatory topos of insensitivity (ll. 1–4); b) life for me, however, has become unbearable without her and—as can be surmised from the following lines—my only wish is to die (ll. 5–8).

The function of the priamel lies precisely in highlighting a basic idea against the backdrop of another one serving as contrast or comparison; cf. W. H. Race, *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius,* Leiden 1982 (with a long list of examples commented on, although this passage is not mentioned); cf. also Williams, *Trad. & Orig.*, p. 66. This recourse to the priamel had enjoyed a long literary tradition (cf. Hom. *Il.* 9.378–391; Pind. *P.* 2.13–20; Hor. *Od.* 1.1; 7.1–14; 4.3.1–12; Verg. *Aen.* 6.847–853) which, far from being abandoned by the Latin elegiac poets, was reinforced by them, becoming more frequent and varied, although it also adopts stereotyped forms, particularly in Ovid (cf. Tib. 1.1; 1.9.1–6; 2.3.35–48; Prop. 1.12.15–20; 2.13.9–12 and 17–26; Ov. *Ars* 3.121–127). Other examples of the priamel in Lygdamus are 3.3–8 (*non ut . . . sed ut*); 11–23; 29–32 (*alii/ego*); 4.85–94; 5.1–5 (*vos/mihi*).

To achieve greater refinement, Lygdamus here varies the first part of the traditional scheme of the priamel (*alius* or *alii*), replacing it with another equally familiar rhetorical device, the literary topos of the πρῶτος εὑρετής or *primus inventor* (in this case, of insensitivity), which also enjoyed a long and respected tradition in the field of elegy: cf. Tib. 1.4.59, *tu, qui venerem docuisti vendere primus*; 10.1–2, *quis fuit, horrendos primus qui protulit enses? / quam ferus et vere ferreus ille fuit!*, recognized as

a direct model for Lygd. 2.1–2; Prop. 1.17.13–14 (inventor of sailing) with Fedeli (1980) 408–410; Ov. *Am.* 2.3.3–4 (the first castrator) and 2.11.1–6 (inventor of the boat) with notes by Ramírez de Verger 48 and 65 *ad loc.*; 2.14.5 (the first one to practise abortion). Even before the elegiac genre this topos was quite prominent in Roman literature: cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.3.9–24 (inventor of sailing); Catul. 66.48–50 (= Call. fr. 110.48–50), the curse of the *Chalybes*, universally known as the πρῶτοι εὑρεταί of iron and the forging of this metal (cf. Fordyce 335 *ad* Catul. 66.48; Mynors 13 *ad* Verg. *Ge.* 1.58). After the great elegiac poets of the Augustan age, the topos continued to be used in literature (cf. Sen. *Med.* 301–308; Stat. *Silv.* 3.2.61–64a with Laguna 217; Claud. *Pros.* praef. 1–12; *i.a.*). Although the motif is occasionally used encomiastically (cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.101 with Hollis 52), it is generally, as here, a curse on the *primus inventor* of some pernicious object or activity, in the vast majority of cases a condemnation of sailing (ψόγος ναυτιλίας), though here of insensitivity. On the topos of the *primus inventor*, cf. Nisbet-Hubbard 49–50 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 1.3.12; Fedeli 408–409 *ad* Prop. 1.17.13–14; and, in particular, A. Kleingunther, ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΕΥΡΕΤΗΣ. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Fragestellung* (Philologus, Suppl. XXVI 1), Leipzig 1933.

But as if this were not enough, Lygdamus plays an even more daring rhetorical trick, subdividing the topos of the inventor into the first person to perform a particular act of insensitivity (ll. 1–2) and the first to be the insensitive victim of it (ll. 3–4). As a result, the priamel goes beyond the original scope of the strict contrast between the impotence/sensitivity of the author and the patience/insensitivity of another, in order to implicate the unfeeling perpetrator of this test of patience, the *primus raptor.* Also present, predictably, are the terms of comparison usually found in the erotic topos of insensitivity, *ferreus* and *durus* (see the commentary *ad loc.*). Here Lygdamus imitates the antimilitarist Tibullan formula *ferreus ille fuit*—used twice by Tibullus to refer to the man who chooses war (Tib. 1.2.67(65) and 1.10.2)—but giving it an erotic slant, applying it to the first to cause a *discidium amantium* (l. 2); he then varies the formula—*durus et ille fuit* (l. 3)—to refer to the first lover capable of resisting such a *discidium*; cf. J. H. Brouwers, "*Ferreus ille fuit.* Sens et structure de Tibulle I.2.67–80", *Mnemosyne* 31 (1978) 394.

As for the content, the theme of the poet's despair on seeing his beloved snatched from him by a rival, in conjunction with the idea of dying for love, is previously found in Prop. 2.8, where the particle

sic igitur (l. 17) likewise appears, functioning as a transitional pivot between the two themes; in fact, the clear echo in Lygdamus' *introitus* of the first line of the Propertian elegy (*eripitur nobis iam pridem cara puella*) indicates that the latter is a second model, alongside the above-mentioned passage of Tib. 1.10.1–2. The difference between Prop. 2.8 and Lygd. 2 is that Propertius, faced by the prospect of Cynthia hurling insults and heaping scorn on him after his death (ll. 18–20)—in complete contrast with the picture of a pious and respectful Neaera at the funeral of Lygdamus—decides to take her with him when he dies (ll. 25–28). In both, death follows the loss of the beloved, but in Lygdamus it is desired, while in Propertius it is irremediable; death brings Lygdamus closer to Neaera, while it separates Propertius from Cynthia; both make use of the idea of death to influence their beloved, Lygdamus informing Neaera of his threat to commit suicide, Propertius solemnly warning Cynthia that, if he dies, she will go with him: both women must therefore take great care not to drive their partners to despair.

1–4: note the careful composition of this pair of distichs, with the striking accumulation of linked *figurae repetitionis*: polyptoton (*caram/carum; iuveni/iuvenem; eripuit/erepta*), geminatio (*ille fuit/ . . . ille fuit*), paronomasia (*ferreus/ ferre*), synonymy (*ferreus/durus*), anaphora (*qui . . . qui . . . qui*); cf. Lausberg, *Retórica Literaria*, pp. 97 ff. It should be observed that Tibullus, a clear model for Lygdamus, particularly in this passage, is noted for his extraordinarily abundant, almost abusive, use of anaphora and all rhetorical figures connected with the repetition of words; cf. J. Veremans, "L'anaphore dans l'oeuvre de Tibulle", *AC* 50 (1981) 774–800.

1 primus: on the choice of *primus* in preference to *primum* (Ach. Statius), compare the examples quoted above for the topos of the *primus inventor*, in which the use of *primus* is overwhelmingly predominant (for the striking case of Catul. 66.49, *et qui principio*, note the conclusive οἵ . . . / πρῶτοι of the Callimachean original, which Catullus recreated in Latin, *Fr.* 110.48–50 Pfeiffer).

caram: scil. *caram puellam*; careless syntax in the view of certain scholars, but more of a case of brachylogy. Note that in this way, in conjunction with the holding back of *iuvenem* until l. 2, *caram* and *carumque* remain on their own, highlighted and virtually nominalized in l. 1. For the combination *cara puella*, cf. Lygd. 6.12; *AL* 1213.2.

carumque: for *-que* in the sense of *-ve*, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 11.592, *Tros Italusque*; Hofmann-Szantyr 479 (§ 255 f); Ernout-Thomas 447 (§ 429).

puellae: a term used in Latin elegy to refer familiarly to the elegiac beloved or any woman in an amorous context. Cf. Pichon, p. 245 s.v.

2 eripuit: "snatched away", since the beloved is considered to belong to the individual. The repeated use of this verb in Lygdamus (cf. ll. 4 and 30), and the formula *cara puella* (l. 1), are clear echoes of the Propertian model quoted above (cf. Prop. 2.8.1, *eripitur nobis iam pridem cara puella*; 29, *abrepta coniuge*). The use of this verb in an amorous context is already found in Plautus (eg *Merc.* 973, *adulescenti amanti amica eripere*) and Terence (eg *Ad.* 90, *eripuit mulierem quam amabat*); cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 3.330–331, (*Orestes*) *ereptae magno flammatus amore / coniugis*; Prop. 2.34.2, *sic erepta mihi paene puella mea est*; Sen. *Ag.* 1003 (Clytemnestra on Agamemnon), *coniugem ereptum mihi* (ie *a Cassandra*); *ThLL* 5.2.791.67 ff. The uncompromising starkness of the word is reinforced by its extensive use in connection with the *acerba mors* which carries off one's loved ones, especially when it is a case of *mors immatura*; cf. Cic. *Ep.* 4.13.2, (*familiares*) *quos . . . mors eripuit nobis*; Catul. 68.106; Verg. *Aen.* 2.738; 10.878–879 (Mezentius to Aeneas), *quid me erepto, saevissime, nato / terres?*; [Albinov.] *Liv.* 65, *erepta . . . stirpe sororis*; there are numerous examples in tombstone inscriptions; cf. *CLE* 78.1; 423.2; 1041.4; 1109.1, *quum praematura raptum mihi morte Nepotem / flerem . . .*; 1260.1, *hic situs est Amphion ereptus prima iuventa*; 2010, *o nefas, quam floridos cito, mors, eripis annos*; P. Colafrancesco-M. Massaro, *Concordanze dei CLE*, Bari 1986, pp. 205–206 s.v. *erepta*, *eripio* and similar; *ThLL* 5.2.793.58 ff.).

iuvenem: a term frequently used in Latin elegy to refer to the male beloved; cf. Tib. 2.1.76, *ad iuvenem tenebris sola puella venit*; Pichon, p. 180 s.v.

ferreus ille fuit: the same phrase at the beginning of a hexameter is found in Tib. 1.2.67(65), and at the end of a pentameter in Tib. 1.10.2.

ferreus: for this adjective applied to people as an elegiac term denoting insensitiviy ("made of iron" > "hard of heart"), cf. Tib. 1.2.67(65), *ferreus ille fuit qui . . .*; 10.2, *ferreus ille fuit*; 2.3.2, *ferreus est, heu, heu, quisquis in urbe manet*; Prop. 2.8.12, *illa tamen numquam ferrea dixit: "amo"*; Ov. *Met.* 13.516 (with Bömer 330), where Hecuba describes herself as *ferrea* for being able to go on living when her sons, her husband and her daughter Polyxena; 14.712; 721, *age, ferrea, gaude!* (with Bömer 221); McKeown 139 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.6.27 (*ianitor*) *ferreus*; *ThLL* 6.574.31 ff.; Pichon, p. 146. The motif has Greek precursors;

cf. Ar. *Ach* 491, σιδηροῦς τ' ἀνήρ; Theocr. 3.39, ἀδαμαντίνα; [Theocr.] 23.20, λάϊνε παῖ. On the topos, cf. A. Hermann, "Das Steinharte Herz", *JbAC* 4 (1961) 77–107 (especially pp. 88–90 for classical Antiquity).

For the proverbial use of iron as a topos of insensitivity, cf. Tib. 1.1.63, *flebis: non tua sunt duro praecordia ferro / vincta*...; Prop. 1.16.30, *sit licet et ferro durior et chalybe*; Ov. *Met.* 7.32–33, *hoc ego si patiar*... / *tum ferrum est scopulos gestare in corde fatebor*; 14.172, *durior et ferro*; cf. Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 134 s.v. *ferrum* 1 (655); Opelt, *Die lateinischen Schimpfwörter*, 1965, pp. 30 and 35.

For the etymological wordplay between *ferreus* and *ferre* (l. 3), the obvious model is Tib. 1.10.1–6, where *ferreus* is associated in terms of both etymology and alliteration with *proferre* (*protulit*, l. 1), *ferus* (l. 2), *fera* (l. 6), and by metonymy with the *enses* (= *ferrum*) of l. 1; cf. F. Cairns, *Tibullus, a Hellenistic Poet at Rome* (1979) 99; D. N. Levin, "War and Peace in Early Roman Elegy", *ANRW* II.30.1, pp. 513–515. However, in using *durus* (l. 3), Lygdamus avoids the Tibullan play on *ferreus/ferus* which enjoyed a long tradition (cf. Enn. *Ann.* 183–184 V., *feroque / ornatur ferro*; Cic. *Quint.* 1.3.3, *quem ego ferus ac ferreus e complexu dimisi meo*).

3 durus: for its metaphorical use as an elegiac term for unfeelingness, cf. Tib. 1.8.50, *dura puella* (= 2.6.28); Prop. 1.1.10, *durae*... *Iasidos* (= *Atalantae*); 1.17.16, *quamvis dura, tamen rara puella fuit*; 3.20.3, *durus, qui lucro potuit mutare puellam.* This adjective is strikingly frequent in Lygdamus, and always appears with a metaphorical sense (cf. 4.76, *pectora dura*; 92; 5.22; 6.7). For the various semantic nuances of the adjective in the elegiac poets, see E. Lenotti, "Semantica di *durus* in Tibullo", *Prometheus* 16 (1990) 27–42; cf. Pichon, p. 136 s.v. In conjunction with *ferreus*, in images of insensitivity, *durus* strictly evokes the hardness of stone, like *saxeus* (cf. Plin. *Ep.* 2.3.7, *saxeus ferreusque es*). For the proverbial use of stone as a topos of insensitivity (in Latin, from Enn. *Scen.* 139 [Fast. 162a 30 = 158,10 L.], *lapideo sunt corde multi, quos non miseret neminis*), cf. Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 185 s.v. *lapis* 1; p. 310 s.v. *saxum* 1; p. 322 s.v. *silex*. The pairing of iron and flint as images of "hardness" is constant from Greek epic onwards (cf. Hom. *Il.* 4.510, οὔ σφι λίθος χρὼς οὐδὲ σίδηρος; A. *Pr.* 242, σιδηρόφρων τε κἀκ πέτρας εἰργασμένος; E. *Med.* 1279, ὡς ἄρ' ἦσθα πέτρος ἢ σίδαρος; Tib. 1.10.59, *lapis est ferrumque, suam quicumque puellam verberat*; Ov. *Am.* 3.6.59, *ille habet et silices et vivum in pectore ferrum*; *Met.* 7.32–33, *hoc ego si patiar*... / *tum ferrum est scopulos gestare in corde fatebor*; 14.712–713,

durior et ferro, quod Noricus excoquit ignis, / et saxo, quod adhuc vivum radice tenetur; *Ponto* 4.10.3–4; Quint. *Decl.* 6.19, *non erat illi ferrum pectus nec cor silice concretum*; cf. also Hor. *Od.* 1.3.9 ff., *illi robur et aes triplex / circa pectus erat, qui . . . / . . . / primus*). For the topos, cf. A. Hermann, *op. cit.* in n. on l. 2 *ferreus*.

et: here in the cumulative sense (= "also, besides"), an infrequent usage in the archaic and classical periods. Cicero generally only used *et* in this sense when the particle was followed by adversative conjunctions or—as here—by pronouns (*et ille*). In the post-classical period this meaning becomes fairly general (= *etiam*). Cf. Kühner-Stegmann II.2.3; Hofmann-Szantyr 483 (§ 256 i); Ernout-Thomas 440 (§ 424); Bassols II.92 (§ 91.1).

tantum ferre dolorem: the same expression at the end of a hexameter is found in Val.-Flac. 1.766; cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 9.425–426 (Nisus after the death of Euryalus), *nec . . . / . . . tantum potuit perferre dolorem/*. The phrase *ferre* (or compound) *dolorem* generally closes the line; cf. Lucr. 3.987, *poterit perferre dolorem/*; Verg. *Aen.* 6.464, *ferre dolorem/*; Prop. 2.15.35, *quam possim nostros alio transferre dolores/*; Luc. *Civ.* 2.39, *neve hunc differte dolorem/*; Maxim. 3, *ferre dolores/*; Gesta Bereng. 3.13 p. 384, *tantumne potis perferre dolorem/*; Schumann II p. 253. As regards the content, cf. Ov. *Met.* 14.716, *non tulit impatiens longi tormente doloris / Iphis* (*impatiens* answers to *non haec patientia*). Note, too, that Iphis decides to commit suicide out of a sore heart.

dolorem: a key term in this elegy, where it appears another three times (ll. 6, 13, 29; cf. also Lygd. 6.3; 43). In elegy *dolor* and *doleo* describe suffering in love caused by unkind treatment on the part of a *dura puella* (eg Tib. 2.4.7; 5.110; Prop. 1.18.3; 13; 26), and more specifically the anguish of the lover who is spurned (eg Tib. 2.3.73; Prop. 1.16.21; 25; 35), deceived (eg Tib. 1.8.73; Ov. *Am.* 2.5.59) or separated from his beloved—as here—by *discidium* or for some other reason (eg Catul. 96.2; Tib. 1.2.1; 5.38; Ov. *Her.* 10.33); cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 4.419–420 (Dido to Anna), *hunc ego si potui tantum sperare dolorem, et perferre, soror, potero*; 9.425–426 (cited in previous note); Pichon, pp. 132–133.

3–4 fuit . . . potuit: these practically function as real gnomic perfects, since the distich, far removed from the influence of *primus* (l. 1), is felt as a declaration that is universal in scope.

4 vivere et: in the elegiac distich, elision of the final syllable of the present infinitive with a following *et* is rare; according to statistics by Smith (225–226 *ad* Tib. 1.2.72), such elision in the first foot is only

attested, apart from the present case, in Tib. 1.2.72, */iungere et*; Prop. 1.5.20, */discere et*; 17.18, */cernere et*; 2.8.32, */fervere et*; 29B.24, */visere: et in*; Ov. *Am.* 1.9.22; *Ars* 3.784; never in the second, third or fifth foot; in the fourth, only in Prop. 1.3.16, *sumere et arma manu/*.

erepta coniuge: for the expression, repeated in l. 30, cf. Catul. 68.105–106, *ereptum . . . / coniugium*; Verg. *Aen.* 3.330–331, (*Orestes*) *ereptae magno flammatus amore / coniugis* (scil. *Hermiones*); 9.138 *coniuge praerepta*; Prop. 2.8.29, *abrepta desertus coniuge Achilles*; Sen. *Ag.* 1003, *coniugem ereptum mihi*; cf. also [Verg.] *Cir.* 295, *te erepta* (with Lyne 225); Ov. *Met.* 5.10, *praereptae coniugis*; 7.732, *coniugis abrepti.*

coniuge: for the term, cf. Lygd. 1.26–27 *coniunx* (comm.).

qui potuit: pleonastic repetition of the *qui* in l. 3, with an emphatic, accumulative effect. For such repetition, which is not infrequent in poetry, apart from Lygd. 3.36, (*tristes sorores*) *stamina quae ducunt quaeque futura canunt*, and 6.20, *qui . . . quique una*, cf. Catul. 64.96, *quae regis Golgos quaeque Idalium frondosum*; Verg. *Ge.* 4.382–383, *Nymphasque sorores / centum quae silvas, centum quae flumina servant*; Ov. *Met.* 11.729–730, *moles . . . quae . . . et . . . quae . . .* ; Hor. *Poet.* 181; Juv. 7.54.

5–8: development of the second term of the priamel (*ego*), in which two parts can clearly be distinguished: a) the first distich (ll. 5–6) is the reverse of *tantum ferre dolorem* (l. 3b); b) in the second distich *vitae . . . taedia* and the veiled allusion to suicide answer to the *vivere . . . potuit* of l. 4.

5–6: the elevated style of this distich is striking, with two pure noun clauses rounded off by an explanatory clause with a clear proverbial flavour. The effect is aided by the archaizing use of *ingenium* in the sense of "character" and the extremely poetic *cor.*

5 non ego: a frequent combination at the beginning of a line; cf. Catul. 64.221; Verg. *Ecl.* 1.75; 3.17; *Ge.* 2.42; *Aen.* 2.785; 4.425 (with Pease 352–353); 12.189; [Verg.] *Cir.* 18; 259; 328 (with Lyne 241); Tib. 1.1.41; 57; 2.65; 85; 87; 6.29; 73; 8.1; 2.3.80; 4.16; 6.42; [Tib.] 3.7.177; 13.7; Lygd. 5.7; 6.59; Prop. 1.2.25; 5.27; 6.29; 13.19; 19.1; 2.1.19; 12.20; 13.9; 24A.6; 29B.33; 3.9.35; Ov. *Her.* 5.156; 7.165–166; 21(20).119; *Rem.* 5; *Met.* 1.182; *Ponto* 2.9.67; Val.-Max. 8.94; Petr. *Satyr.* 133.3; Stat. *Theb.* 11.344–345; *Silv.* 5.5.66; Sil. 6.504–505; Claud. *Pros.* 2.255–256; for elsewhere in the line, cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.20.5–6.

The formula *non ego* is characteristic of the *aversio*; on this rhetorical figure, cf. Quint. *Inst.* 9.2.39, *illa quoque vocatur* ***aversio,*** *quae a proposita quaestione abducit audientem: 'non ego cum Danais Troianam exscindere*

gentem / Aulide iuravi (Verg. *Aen.* 4.425–426); *quod fit et multis et variis figuris cum aut aliud expectasse nos aut maius aliquid timuisse simulamus aut plus videri posse ignorantibus*; Lausberg, *Retórica literaria*, p. 257 [§ 848]. For further examples of *aversio* introduced by *non (ego)*, cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.6.33–34 (with McKeown 141); 2.2.63–64; *Ponto* 2.9.67–72; Pease 352–353 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 4.425–426. Lygdamus seems to have a predilection for this rhetorical figure; cf. 5.7 (comm.); 6.59. For *non* beginning a line, emphasizing a more energetic or passionate negation, as a poetic cliché, especially among the elegiac poets (in Propertius there are 85 examples of initial *non*, 10 of them *non ego*; in Tibullus the proportion is 28/12), cf. A. Guillemin, "L'évolution d'un cliché poétique", *REL* 19 (1941) 101–113; A. Sauvage, "Tibulle et son temps", *Latomus* 28 (1969) 893 n. 3.

ego: with *-ŏ* "is the invariable scansion in classical poetry" (Lindsay, *The Latin Language*, p. 422); cf. Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, pp. 50–51. In Lygdamus *ego* (9 times) always occupies the end of the first foot of the hexameter or pentameter, that is, it is always the second word in the line (cf. 2.5; 26; 4.49; 69; 72; 82; 5.7; 6.43; 59). This would appear to be the general tendency among the elegiac poets: in the genuine Tibullus, out of 32 appearances, only on four occasions does *ego* occupy a position further along the line (cf. 1.1.77; 6.38; 9.37; 75).

firmus: for the use of this term to refer to firm resolve in the context of *discidium amoris*, cf. Ov. *Rem.* 245, *firmata . . . mente*; 697, *qui silet, est firmus.*

patientia: a noun rarely found in poetry; Lucr. 0; Verg. 0; Hor. 2 (*Od.* 1.24.19; *Ep.* 1.17.25); Tib. 0; Prop. 0 (cf. 1.16.29, *patientior*); Ov. 9 (*Am.* 2.19.59; 3.11.1; *Met.* 2.123; 5.373; 667; 9.164; 14.486; *Tr.* 4.6.21; 5.12.31); Lygd. 1; Stat. 0. For the pentameter-ending *non haec patientia nostro/*, cf. Ov. *Met.* 5.373, *quae iam patientia nostra est/* (with Bömer 321).

nostro: ie *meo*. The use of the 1st person plural for the 1st person singular can be traced back to Ennius (cf. *Ann.* 377 V., *nos sumus Romani, qui fuimus ante Rudini*) and is documented for all periods of Latin, both in poetry and in prose, especially in the letters of Cicero; cf. Hofmann, *Latín familiar*, pp. 201–202 (§ 126); Kühner-Stegmann 1.87–88; Hofmann-Szantyr 19–20 (§ 30). This usage apparently originated in colloquial daily language (cf. Hofmann, *Latín familiar*, pp. 201–202 [§ 126]), though its widespread use in the language of literature is due to the influence of rhetoric; for this reason it is very frequent in

elegy, where rhetoric plays an important role (especially in Propertius and Ovid, less so in Tibullus), in particular when it affects, as it does here, the personal or possessive pronoun (*nos* / *noster* instead of *ego* / *meus*; cf. Smith 209 *ad* Tib. 1.2.11 *dementia nostra*); it is less common in the verb (eg Tib. 1.3.53; 5.67; 2.3.79; 4.5, *seu quid merui seu nil peccavimus*). Sometimes the singular and plural pronoun forms appear in proximity or in combination, as here (*ego* . . . *nostro*), without any obvious difference in meaning; cf. eg Catul. 68.132, *lux mea se nostrum contulit in gremium*; 91.1–2; 100.5–7; 107.3–4 (with Fordyce 394, together with bibliography); Tib. 1.2.11–12; 3.14–15; 4.77–78; 9.48; 75; 2.1.35; 4.51–52; [Tib.] 4.5.5–6; 7.3–4; 11.5–6; 14.1–2; and with substantial frequency in Propertius (cf. Rothstein 68 *ad* Prop. 1.1.33) and Ovid (cf. Bömer 232 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 1.772). Rhetoric aside, possible reasons for the change in number are based on psychology, style (variation of expression) or rhythm and metre. On this point, see also W. S. Maguinness, "The Singular Use of *Nos* in Virgil", *CQ* 35 (1941) 126–135; Barratt 53 *ad* Luc. *Civ.* 5.158; for the change in number in the 2nd person (*te* . . . *vester* [= *tuus*] . . . *te*), cf. Bömer 386 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 15.494–497; A. E. Housman, "*Vester* = *tuus*", *CQ* 3 (1909) 244–248 (= *The Classical Papers*, 1972, pp. 790–793).

6 ingenio: here in the archaizing sense of "way of being, character, temperament", Gr. φύσις, εὐφυία, ἕξις (cf. Char. p. 462.8 B.; Synon. Cic. p. 430, *ingenium: natura, mores, specimen, indoles animi*). For the use of the term to denote the "spirit", representing constancy and purpose (Gr. θυμός), cf. Enn. *Ann.* 414, *ingenio forti*; *Scen.* 25, *tam firmo ingenio et tanta confidentia*; Ov. *Her.* 19(18).6, *fortius ingenium suspicor esse viris*; *Ars* 1.185; *ThLL* 7.1.1526.81 ff. For a similar combination of the terms *patientia* and *ingenium*, cf. Ov. *Tr.* 5.12.31, *contudit ingenium patientia longa malorum*.

frangit fortia corda dolor: proverbial expression (*sententia*). The adverb *vel* or *etiam* is understood before *fortia*. Note the strong alliteration of fricative and dental sounds (*f*, *r*, *t*, *d*), which I have tried to reflect in the Spanish translation through the cacophonic repetition of the syllable 'que': "que quebranta los fuertes corazones el dolor". Quite different in tone is another *sententia* by Pacuvius: *lapit cor cura* (Pacuv. *Periboea frg.* 3 [276 Ribb.]).

The *sententia*, a brief maxim condensing a universally-applicable thought or reflecting a piece of moral advice, enjoyed considerable popularity as a rhetorical device—to adorn the literary work—in both Greek and Latin literature, particularly in post-Ovidian authors

(Seneca, Tacitus, Phaedrus, Persius, Juvenal, Lucan and Martial); Ovid represents the transition between the measured, precise use of the Augustan poets (eg Verg. *Ecl.* 10.69, *omnia vincit amor*...; *Ge.* 1.145 *labor omnia vicit*... ; *Aen.* 10.284, *audentes Fortuna iuvat*; Hor. *Od.* 3.2.13, *dulce et decorum est pro patria mori*; 4.65, *vis consilii expers mole ruit sua*; *Sat.* 1.3.74–75, *aequum est peccatis veniam poscentem reddere rursus*; *Ep.* 1.16.52, *oderunt peccare boni virtutis amore*) and the at-times abusive profusion of the device in the so-called Imperial authors (cf. Quint. *Inst.* 2.4.31; 8.5.2; 33; 12.10.48); cf. Mª T. Martín Rodríguez, "De la *sententia* en la poesía amatoria de Ovidio", *Actas del VIII Congreso Nacional de Estudios Clásicos*, Madrid 1994, pp. 738–744.

frangit... corda: unique expression, a variant on the popular (though not classical) *animum frangere*; cf. eg Pl. *Cist.* 222; Cic. *Sen.* 36; *Quir.* 19; *Sest.* 89; *Att.* 12.21.5; Ov. *Met.* 8.508 (with Bömer 158); *pectora frangere* in Ov. *Fasti* 1.301.

fortia corda: for this Ovidian phrase, cf. Ov. *Tr.* 3.3.57, *forti*... *corde*; Val.-Flac. 1.315, *fortia languent corda patrum*; Sil. 10.519; Aug. *Civ.* 22.22; Paul. Diac. *Carm.* 22.29 p. 59, *movisti ad fletus et fortia corda virorum*; *ThLL* 4.941.44–45; Schumann II p. 336; cf. also Lygd. 6.16, *mollia corda* (comm.).

corda: for *cor* = *animus*, cf. *ThLL* 4.938.22 ff.; Pichon, p. 114.

dolor: on its elegiac sense, see comm. on l. 3 (*dolorem*).

7–8: the poet's admission that he is weary of life. Note the loud hyperbaton *vitae*.../ *perpessae*... *meae*; the emotional syntax reproduces the Lygdamus' faltering voice.

7 loqui pudor est... -que fateri: the impersonal periphrasis *pudor est* + infinitive, poetic equivalent to *pudet*, is previously attested in Prop. 3.13.20, *pudor est non licuisse mori* (with Fedeli 427); frequent in Ovid (cf. *Ars* 3.203; *Rem.* 359; *Met.* 14.18; *Fasti* 1.205; 5.532; Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana* [Cambridge 1956] 304).

vera loqui: the combination of a neuter plural adjective or participle with *loqui* is normal to indicate the nature of what is said; *vera loqui* in Ov. *Her.* 16.60, *vera loquar*; 18.66; 21.29; *Met.* 10.20; *Fasti* 5.465; Juv. 16.33; never in Virgil (cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.1.24, *ridentem dicere verum*; *Ep.* 1.18.28, *et ait prope vera*; Tib. 1.6.31, *dicere vera*); cf. also Ov. *Met.* 2.570, *nota loquor*; 7.549, *mira loquar*; *Fasti* 3.370, *mira, sed acta loquor*.

7–8 vitae... taedia: the typically Ovidian expression *taedia vitae* is very frequently used as a euphemism in connection with the idea of death and suicide; cf. Ov. *Met.* 10.482, *inter mortisque metus et taedia*

vitae. (with Bömer 482); 10.626 (Atalanta on Hippomenes, who is determined to compete with her, which the heroine regards as "suicide", since the price of a "certain" defeat is his life), *intereat, quoniam tot caede procorum / admonitus non est agiturque in* ***taedia vitae***; *Ponto* 1.9.31, *haec mihi verba* (scil. *solacia Celsi*) *minuerunt taedia vitae* (= "my desire to commit suicide"; cf. ll. 21–22, *o quotiens vitae custos invisus amarae / continuit* [scil. Celsus] *promptas in mea fata manus!*); *Nux* 159, *cum longae venerunt taedia vitae*; Stat. *Theb.* 7.464, *taedia vitae*; also in prose, eg Plin. *Nat.* 7.186, *L. Domitius* . . ., *Corfinii captus ab* . . . *Caesare, veneno poto propter* ***taedium vitae***; Sen. *Suas.* 6.17, *taedium* . . . *eum et fugae et vitae cepit*; Sen. *Ep.* 24.22, *Epicurus* . . . *ait: 'ridiculum est currere ad mortem taedio vitae* . . .*'*; cf. also the particularly poetic variant *taedia lucis* in Ov. *Tr.* 4.10.115–118, *ergo quod vivo durisque laboribus obsto, / nec me* ***sollicitae taedia lucis*** *habent, / gratia, Musa, tibi, tu medicina venis.* The combination with the verb, however, is frequent in Cicero; cf. Cic. *Att.* 2.24.4, *sed prorsus vitae taedet*; 5.16.2, *taedet omnino eos vitae*; cf. Luc. *Civ.* 5.739–740 (Pompey to Cornelia), *ille gemes "non nunc vita mihi dulcior", inquit / "cum* ***taedet vitae****, laeto sed tempore, coniunx".* According to statistics by Bömer (457 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 9.616–617, *taedia capio* [= *me taedet*]), Ovid prefers *taedia*, often with periphrasis,—18 times (+ *Nux* 159)—to the verbal expression *taedet* (only found in *Ars* 2.325); in other authors the proportion is not so significant: Verg. 1 (*Ge.* 4.332):3 (in *Aen.*); Hor. 1:0; Tib. 1 (1.4.15–16):1; Prop. 1:0.

The motif of *taedium vitae* in epitaphs is extremely important in connection with *optata mors*; cf. *CLE* 1430.3 (= *ICUR* 7.19742; *ILCV* 4753), *tu senium et fessae fovisti taedia vitae*; B. Lier, "Topica carminum sepulcralium latinorum", *Philologus* 62 (1903) 464; Thompson, *Taedium vitae in Roman Sepulchral Inscriptions*, Diss. St. Louis 1911; E. Lissberger, *Das Fortleben der römischen Elegiker in den CE*, Diss. Tübingen (1934) 96; Lattimore, *Themes in Epitaphs*, pp. 205–210 (§ 56). On suicide as an elegiac topos, see F. Navarro, "Los *taedia vitae* o el suicidio elegíaco", *Actas IX Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos (1995)*, in print.

vitae . . . perpessae: cf. Sil. 2.619, *perpessaeque ultima vitae.*

8 mala: this is the term used by the elegiac poets to refer to their suffering in love; cf. Tib. 2.6.19, *iam mala finissem leto*, in a similar context; further examples in Pichon, p. 195 s.v. *mala.*

9–30: funeral fantasy. Lygdamus, in a long description, gives detailed instructions on how he would like his funeral service to be held and what form he would eventually prefer his tomb to take.

Here, once again, he is imitating the older elegiac poets. In particular, his main models are Prop. 2.13.17–36 and Tib. 1.3.5–9 (picked up later in Ov. *Am.* 3.9). In the structure of the *descriptio funeris* (or *mortis*) Lygdamus is closer to Propertius: an equally brusque start by means of a transitory particle (*igitur*, *ergo*), plus an elegant formula introducing the moment of death; detailed instructions for burial, finally focusing on the tomb and the epitaph. Missing in Lygdamus, however, is the overt repudiation, as in Propertius, of the signs of ostentation that are characteristic of luxurious funerals (ll. 19–24): Lygdamus focuses directly on the presence of his beloved at the funeral, and the display of affection he expects from her. From Tibullus he takes the touching detail of the collection of the bones, the *ossilegium*, which he expands upon by giving meticulous details of the ritual, as well as the presence at the ceremony, alongside his lover, of other female figures, which helps to intensify the pathos of the scene: in Tibullus, the poet's mother and sister; in Lygdamus, on the other hand, only the mother of Neaera. Unlike in Tibullus and Propertius, where this *descriptio funeris* only takes up a few of the many lines which constitute their respective elegies, and in which death is subordinate to other central themes, in Lygdamus this theme takes on greater relevance and substance, since his funeral fantasy occupies virtually all of this short elegy.

9: brusque transition to the theme of death, to which reference is made by means of an elegant formula, as in Prop. 2.1.71, *quandocumque igitur vitam mea fata reposcent*; 13.17, *quandocumque igitur nostros mors claudet ocellos*; cf. also Tib. 1.1.59, *suprema mihi cum venerit hora*.

ergo cum: the reading *ergo ego cum* of some mss. and editions does not appear to be a particularly felicitous one, since *ego* appeared only a few lines above (l. 5); and whereas there the dialectic scheme of the 'priamel' more than justifies its presence for the sake of emphasis, here it is quite superfluous, for there is no risk at all of confusion, in view of the obvious *fuero mutatus*, and neither is there a change in viewpoint or protagonist with respect to the previous lines which would make advisable the presence of the pronoun for the sake of clarity.

ergo: a favourite illative particle of Lygdamus, always at the beginning of a line (cf. 4.75; 6.51); in contrast, neither *igitur* nor *itaque* occur. The use of illative particles, in spite of their possible prosaic tone, is fairly frequent even in the most elevated poetry (cf. *ThLL* s.v.). Nevertheless, the striking absence of particles of this type in the

two genuine books of Tibullus is worthy of mention. As regards prosody, *ergo* is always scanned with -ō in Lygdamus, as is the norm among the elegiac poets (except Ov. *Her.* 5.59; *Tr.* 1.1.87); cf. Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, p. 52. On the other hand, the shortening of the final -*o* is characteristic of much Silver Age Latin poetry (cf. R. Hartenberger, *De 'o' finali apud poetas latinos ab Ennio usque ad Iuvenalem*, Diss. Bonn 1911). This 'pre-Ovidian' scansion is the main formal objection to the argument that Lygdamus was born in the year 69 AD and was a peer of Statius, Martial and Silius Italicus. However, as Axelson rightly observes ("Geburtjahr", p. 289; *pace* Büchner, "Lygdamus", p. 96), not only does the shortness of the Lygdamus cycle—just 290 lines—make it impossible to draw chronological conclusions, but in addition the scansion of *ergo* as a spondee is, for one thing, easily explained in a poet of such classical tendencies and such a fervent imitator of Ovid—this being a very Ovidian opening to a hexameter: 5 times in *Am.*, 8 in *Tr.*—and for another, this scansion is not entirely unknown in the 1st c. BC, being attested in Silius (11.567; 16.217) and the only form known to Petronius (4 times), albeit in his contemporary Seneca only *ergŏ* is found. The same goes for *virgō* in Lygd. 4.31 (5 times thus in Sil., only once as *virgŏ*, the only scansion in Stat. and Mart.) and above all for *dicō* in Lygd. 4.49 (normal scansion in Sil. and Mart., quite frequent in Stat.).

tenuem . . . in umbram: the postponement or anastrophe of the preposition with respect to the noun phrase it governs seems to have been the primitive Latin word order, as can be seen in Oscan-Umbrian. In archaic Latin, however, anastrophe is already in clear decline. Of the two possible combinations of elements within a prepositional noun phrase affected by anastrophe, the variant adjective-preposition-noun (eg *magnu cum gemitu*) is quite frequent from the beginnings of Latin literature, less frequent in Terence than in Plautus and Ennius, and from Lucretius onwards, virtually the norm in poetry, as well as being very frequent in all periods of Latin. Although the combination is not infrequent in prose from ancient times (cf. *CIL* I^2 593 = Dessau 6085.61, *certeis de causis*; Cic. *Senect.* 22, *quod propter studium*), in the case of the attributive genitive (cf. Lygd. 6.14, *dominae . . . in arbitrium*), anastrophe is only attested in prose from Sallust onwards and restricted to the historiographers (cf. [Sall.] *Rep.* 1.2.5, *occupandae rei publicae in spem adducti*). The reverse combination of noun-preposition-adjective, however, though equally archaic (cf. Pl. *Ps.* 174, *viris cum summis*), is predominantly poetic (*Rhet. Her.* 4.32.44 censures

it as a *perversio*, and it is not found in prose before Livy); cf. Bömer 22–23 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 1.18 *corpore in uno*; A. G. Calvo, "*Quom* y la anástrofe primitiva", *Emerita* 19 (1951) 157–190 (esp. § 9, pp. 177–180); Marouzeau, *L'ordre des mots* III, p. 35 ff.; Kühner-Stegmann 2.1.587–588; Hofmann-Szantyr 216 (§ 114 *Zus.* b); Ernout-Thomas 119–120 (§ 141); Bassols I.229 (§ 223.2).

For the phrase *tenuis umbra*, cf. Verg. *Ge.* 4.472, *umbrae ibant tenues*; cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 6.292, *tenues sine corpore vitae*; Ov. *Tr.* 4.10.86, *gracilis umbra*; *Fasti* 2.565, *animae tenues*; for *mutatus in*, cf. Sen. *Dial.* 6 (*Cons. ad Marc.*) 25.3, *erubesce . . . mutatos in melius tuos flere.*

fuero: with -ō, the normal scansion in the future among the elegiac poets; cf. Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, p. 52.

mutatus in umbram: a reference to the cremation of the corpse on the funeral pyre. According to ancient belief, through the flames of the pyre the soul (*umbra*) is freed from the body; cf. Prop. 4.7.1–2, *sunt aliquid Manes: letum non omnia finit, / luridaque evictos effugit umbra rogos*; Ov. *Fasti* 5.463 (on Remus), *elapsa rogi flammis et inanis imago*; *Tr.* 1.5.12, (*spiritus*) *in tepido deseret ossa rogo* (with Luck 51); 3.3.59–62, *atque utinam pereant animae cum corpore nostrae, / effugiatque avidos pars mihi nulla rogos! / nam si morte carens vacua volat altus in aura / spiritus . . .*; 4.10.85–86, *si tamen exstinctis aliquid nisi nomina restat, / et gracilis structos effugit umbra rogos*; cf. also Ov. *Met.* 8.524–525 (on Meleager's transformation into a pyre), *inque leves abiit paulatim spiritus auras / paulatim cana prunam velante favilla.* For the structure *mutare in* with reference to processes of metamorphosis ("to turn, change into"), cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.20.10, *album mutor in alitem*; Ov. *Met.* 1.1–2, *in nova fert animus mutatas dicere formas / corpora*; 409; 610; 3.329; *Tr.* 3.3.83, *quamvis in cineres corpus mutaverit ignis*; Sen. *Nat.* 2.26.1; Plin. *Nat.* 7.36, *ex feminis mutari in mares*; Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.231; Apul. *Met.* 1.9. Occasionally *mutare cum* is found (cf. Ov. *Met.* 3.196–197, *cum pedibusque manus, cum longis bracchia mutat / cruribus*; Sen. *Oed.* 451, *Nereus . . . caerula cum pratis mutat freta*), but the ablative of result is the norm; cf. Sall. *Cat.* 58.15; Verg. *Ge.* 1.8, *Chaoniam pingui glandem mutavit arista*; 2.511, *exilioque domos et dulcia limina mutant*; Ov. *Met.* 8.448, *auratis mutavit vestibus atras*; *OLD muto* 12 a,b.

umbram: ie *animam*, "the soul of the dead man", a frequent sense in poetry; cf. Lucr. 4.42, *ne forte . . . reamur . . . umbras inter vivos volitare*; Verg. *Ge.* 4.472; *Aen.* 2.772; 4.386; 5.734; 6.264; 294; 401; 11.831; Hor. *Epod.* 5.93; Paneg. Mes. 68 (= [Tib.] 3.7.68); Prop. 2.8.19; Ov. *Met.* 4.434; 443, *errant exsangues sine corpore et ossibus umbrae*; 5.358; 7.249;

8.476 (with Bömer 151); 10.12; 16; 11.61; 660; 12.591; 13.449; 14.117; 15.797; *Tr.* 5.14.12; Luc. *Civ.* 6.310; Sen. *Her. O.* 1478; Mart. 10.26.4; Stat. *Silv.* 2.4.33; 6.96; *Theb.* 2.667; Juv. 8.65; first in prose in Liv. 40.56.9; J. Novákovà, *Umbra*, Berlin 1964, pp. 44 ff.; *OLD umbra* 7.

10: this pentameter rounds off the necrological reference of the preceding hexameter and situates us chronologically in the instant following the cremation of Lygdamus' corpse on the pyre; that is, we are witness to his funeral "in medias res", after the cortège and the pre-incineration rites.

Although the primitive funeral rite of the Roman people, according to Cicero (*Leg.* 2.22.56) and Pliny (*Nat.* 7.187), seems to have been inhumation, cremation was the normal practice in Republican times, dating back to as early as 400 BC; indeed, Tacitus (*Ann.* 16.6) describes it as a *Romanus mos.* The 2nd c. AD witnesses the start of a gradual shift towards inhumation, attested by the sudden flowering of carved sarcophagi in the Roman world. The reasons for the change are complex, but by the mid 3rd c. AD the practice had spread throughout the provinces; cf. Toynbee, *Death and Burial*, pp. 39–42; 49 ff; *OCD* s.v. *Dead, disposal of* (pp. 314–315).

As for the formulation, note the careful aAbB distribution of nouns and adjectives, as well as the chromatic antithesis *candida/nigra*, which is deliberately chosen and highlighted, in view of the fact that the adjectives are completely superfluous epithets. For the formulation of the line, Fletcher (p. 49) quotes the *CLE* 1120.4, *cineres ... quos cana favilla teget.*

candida ... ossa: recalls the Homeric phrase ὀστέα λευκὰ, which occurs frequently in funerary contexts (cf. Hom. *Il.* 23.252; 24.793; *Od.* 24.72).

candidaque: for the enclytic *-que* avoiding elision, Smith 244 *ad* Tib. 1.3.34, *reddereque* (the only example in elegy of this use of *-que* with infinitives), quotes for nouns and adjectives Tib.1.6.48; 10.26; [Tib.] 3.9.10; 25 *loci* in Prop., 24 in the *opera amatoria* of Ovid.

candida ... nigra: Lygdamus uses the adjective *candidus* 5 times (cf. 2.18; 4.34; 6.1; 30), *niger* 7 times (cf. 2.18; 3.37; 4.17; 5.5; 15; 33); on the other hand, as regards the corresponding "lacklustre" synonyms *albus* and *ater*, he uses the former only once, and in conjunction with *candida* (cf. Lygd. 4.33 [comm.], while the latter never appears. This may be indicative of Lygdamus' preference for intense colours. On the colour oppositions *albus/candidus* and *ater/niger* ("pale"/ "shining"), cf. Serv. *Ge.* 3.82; J. André, "Le vocabulaire de la couleur",

REL 19 (1941) 140–141; *Termes de couleur*, 25 ff. and 43 ff.; C. Arias, "*Albus-candidus, ater-niger* and *ruber-rutilus* in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. A Structural Research", *Latomus* 43 (1984) 111–117; comm. *ad* Lygd. 4.33–34, *alba . . . candida.*

For Lygdamus' weakness for colour contrasts, cf. also l. 18 (*nigra candida*); 1.9 (*lutea . . . niveum*); 4.34 (*candida . . . rubent*); 5.15 (*cani nigros*).

favilla: as opposed to *cineres*, *favilla* ("burning soot") is strictly the barely cooled ashes of corpses consumed by fire; cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.6.23, *calentem debita sparges lacrima favillam vatis amici*; in particular Plin. *Nat.* 19.19, *corporis favillam ab reliquo separant cinere*; Serv. *Aen.* 3.573, *favilla est deserta igni scintilla*; Pelagon. 110, *cinerem levem, id est favilla quam appellant*; *OLD favilla* 2.

super . . . teget: tmesis for *superteget*, predominantly poetic and in a bisyllabic preposition; tmesis with *super* is attested as early as Pl. *Curc.* 85; cf. also Lucr. 3.878, *esse . . . super*; Verg. *Ecl.* 6.6; *Aen.* 2.567; *loci Ovidiani* in Bömer 280 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.151, *statque super*; in prose, Nep. *Alc.* 8.1; Leumann 129; Marouzeau 3.150 ff.; Hofmann-Szantyr 217 (§ 114 *Zus.* d); Heubner 58 *ad* Tac. *Hist.* 1.20.1, *super . . . erant.* The preverb *super* is preferable to the adverb *supra*, which is transmitted by most of the mss. and followed by a considerable number of ancient and modern editors (cf. app. crit.), given that *super* is quite frequent in hexametrical poetry, while *supra* is attested only exceptionally, and therefore clearly for emphasis (cf. [Tib.] 3.7.66, *seu supra terras Phoebus seu curreret infra*). In a funerary context the phrase *super ossa* is frequent, cf. Tib. 1.3.54, *fac lapis inscriptis stet super ossa notis*; 2.4.50, *terraque securae sit super ossa levis*. In these cases, however, *super* is a genuine preposition, whereas here it simply serves to reinforce *teget.* Note Lygdamus' predilection for the word *ossa*, used no fewer than three times in this short elegy (ll. 10, 17, 26). The verb *supertego* is attested before the end of the 2nd c. AD in Col. *Rust.* 9.14.14, *supertegemus*, and Apul. *Met.* 11.14, in both cases without tmesis. On the deliberate sepulchral tone of this pentameter, cf. *CLE* 1120.4, *cineres . . . quos cana favilla teget*, where, however, the term *cana* is applied to the *favilla* (as in Ov. *Met.* 8.525). On the other hand, cf. Ov. *Met.* 6.325, *nigra favilla*; 13.604, *atra favilla*; *Tr.* 5.5.36, *atra favilla.*

11–12: Lygdamus expresses a wish that Neaera should attend his funeral and honour him with some of the displays of grief (*tristia signa*) that were normal at Roman funeral ceremonies, such as untied, unkempt hair and lengthy weeping; cf. Tib. 1.3.8, *et fleat effusis ante sepulcra comis.* Further habitual signs of grief on the part of women

were tearing the hair (eg Ov. *Met.* 3.506), lacerating the cheeks and beating the breast (cf. Prop. 2.13.27; Ov. *Tr.* 3.3.44–48).

ante meum . . . ante meum: the real difficulty in this distich lies, according to Tränkle 85, in the double appearance of *ante meum*, a striking repetition in that it occurs before the main nucleus of the prepositional phrase (*rogum*) and that in each case *ante* has a different sense—directional with *veniat*; locative with *fleat*. This prompts the critic to suspect, in the apparatus and commentary *ad loc.*, that the *ante meum* of l. 11 is a corruption concealing an original reading *ante urbem*, which would fit in reasonably well with Roman funeral laws and practices. It is known that sanitary precautions had given rise to the formal prohibition of cremating or burying the dead within the city (*pomerium*), a ban dating back to the *Law of the XII Tables*; cf. *Lex Tab.* 10.1 Bruns: *hominem mortuum in urbe ne sepelito neve urito*; Cic. *Leg.* 2.23.58, *hominem mortuum in urbe ne sepelito neve urito*; Toynbee, *Death and Burial*, pp. 48–49. The dead were therefore cremated on the outskirts of Rome (*ante Vrbem*), where burials likewise took place; this explains why epitaphs so frequently appeal to passers-by and wayfarers, since the tombs were generally to be found by the sides of the roads leading from Rome; cf. Prop. 4.7.83–84, *hic carmen* (scil. *sepulcrale*) . . . *scribe* . . . / *sed breve, quod currens vector ab urbe legat*; Toynbee, *op. cit.*, p. 73. In this connection Tränkle 85 cites Prop. 4.7.29–30, *si piguit portas ultra procedere, at illuc / iussisses lectum lentius ire meum*, where the ghost of Cynthia—*ad extremae nuper humata viae*, l. 4—reproaches the poet in his dreams for not having accompanied her funeral cortège beyond the gates of Rome. I would also add Ov. *Tr.* 3.3.65–66, *atque ea* (scil. *ossa*, l. 65) *cum foliis et amomi pulvere misce, / inque* ***suburbano*** *condita pone sole*, where only burial is mentioned, since Ovid feels that his death, and the cremation of his corpse, will take place during his exile in Tomi, although his wish is that his bones should rest in his native land; cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 3.302–304, ***ante urbem*** . . . / *libabat cineri Andromache manisque vocabat / Hectoreum ad tumulum*; Ov. *Met.* 13.687–689, ***ante urbem*** *exequiae tumulique ignesque rogique / effusaeque comas et apertae pectora matres / significant luctus* (lines inspired by the passage of Virgil *sup. cit.*, according to Bömer 385 *ad loc.*). Although the corruption could easily be explained by a slipping forward of the eye to the *ante meum* of l. 12, this is not enough to offer solid justification for the incorporation of this ingenious 'emendatio' into the text. And Tränkle himself must have felt likewise, as he goes no further than the tentative suggestion. The striking repetition and

dramatic hyperbaton may be due to an attempt to reproduce emotion through the syntax.

veniat . . . fleat: subjunctives which combine their exhortative function with the optative (cf. *velim*, l. 26).

11 longos incompta capillos: for the expression, cf. Tib. 1.3.91, *longos turbata capillos*; Ov. *Am.* 1.1.20, *longas compta puella comas*; *Met.* 4.261, *nudis incompta capillis*; identical image in Ov. *Am.* 3.9.52, *inornatas dilaniata comas.* Untied hair is not only a symbol of grief and mourning but a token of respect towards the gods in religious ceremonies, where there should be nothing tied or bound (cf. l. 18 *incinctae* [comm.]). For the accusative of respect, see Lygd. 4.23 (comm.).

capillos: on the terms for "hair" in Latin poetry, see the commentary on Lygd. 1.10 *comas.* Note that, in its 14 appearances in the whole of the *Corp. Tib.*, *capillus* always occupies the end of a line: Tib. 1.3.91; 6.39; 71; 7.51; 8.9; 45; 9.15; 10.37; 10.53; 2.3.23; 5.121; Lygd. 2.11; 5.15; [Tib.] 8.9. The same tendency can be observed in Ovid (cf. Bömer 344 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 413 *alba capillos/*).

12 fleat ante meum . . . rogum: for the expression, cf. Tib. 2.4.46, *ardentem flebitur ante rogum.*

maesta: a more forceful adjective than *tristis* (and a more poetic one, according to McKeown 100 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.4.61; for statistics, see *ThLL* 8.46.4 ff.), denoting profound sadness and affliction, whence the frequent appearance of this adjective and familiar terms (*maereat*, l. 14) in contexts of grief and mourning; cf. Cic. *Mil.* 20; Verg. *Ge.* 3.518; Prop. 2.9.11; Ov. *Tr.* 4.4.76, *i.a.* In fact, this adjective does not only describe the deeply felt sadness of an individual, but also suggests the external dishevelment that befits his gloom; cf. Cic. *Sest.* 1, *maestos sordidatos reos*; Sen. *Oed.* 554, *squalente cultu maestus ingreditur senex;* Col. *Rust.* 10.361, *resoluta sinus, resoluto maesta capillo*; cf. *OLD maestus* 2a. *Maestus* is even used to qualify anything indicating mourning or connected with the funeral; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.64, *stant manibus arae, caeruleis maestae vittis*; 11.35, *maestum Iliades crinem de more solutae*; 189, *maestum funeris ignem* (cf. Serv. *ad loc.*); Ov. *Fasti* 4.454, *feriunt maesta pectora nuda manu*; *Tr.* 3.3.84, *maesta favilla* (with Luck 183); 5.14.6, *maestos . . . rogos*; *Ponto* 3.2.31, *maestis . . . bustis*; Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.136, *maesta . . . cupresso*; cf. *OLD maestus* 2b. *Maesta* here not only alludes to Neaera's grief over the death of Lygdamus, but also to her outward appearance and gestures in keeping with mourning, not only her expressly-mentioned dishevelled hair and her lamentations, but also the other signs of mourning that were current among the Romans.

rogum: the funeral pyre, the fire where corpses are burned; cf. Serv. *Aen.* 11.185, *'pyra' est lignorum congeries, 'rogus' cum iam ardere coeperit dicitur, 'bustum' vero iam exustum vocatur'.*

13–14: in this distich Lygdamus expresses his wish that the mother of Neaera should also attend his funeral. The detail is undoubtedly aimed at intensifying the pathos of the scene, suggesting as it does a team of female mourners, among whom it was normal for the women of the immediate and more distant family to appear; in addition, this enables Lygdamus to play with the terms for family relationships in the pentameter, where once again he clearly reveals his obsessive longing for *coniugium* with Neaera.

13 matris comitata dolore: similar expressions in which a quality, state of mind or activity takes the place of individuals (metonymy of the abstract for the concrete; cf. Lausberg, *Retórica Literaria*, p. 74 [§ 568.4]) are not exclusive to poetry, but are certainly most frequently found there; cf. eg Cic. *Domo* 76, *me populus Romanus . . . sua celebritate laetitiaque comitatum honestavit*; Prop. 1.3.46, *illa fuit lacrimis ultima cura meis* (= "mihi lacrimanti"); 1.20.15–16, *quae miser ignotis error perpessus in oris Herculis* (ie *Hercules errans*); Tib. 1.2.11, *mala si qua tibi dixit dementia nostra* (with n. by Smith 209); Lygd. 3.8, *inque tuo caderet nostra senecta* (= "caderem ego senex") *sinu* (comm.); for the present line in particular, Fletcher (p. 49) quotes Stat. *Ach.* 2.23, *lacrimis comitata sororum*; for the content, see also Ov. *Am.* 3.9.51, *hic soror in partem misera cum matre doloris / venit.* The express mention of the presence and participation in the funeral of other women whom the poet finds pleasing, apart from his beloved, is a note full of pathos and tenderness which Lygdamus takes from Tib. 1.3.5–9, as already mentioned in the commentary on ll. 9–30. Here, however, it is not the mother or sister of the poet, but the mother of the poet's beloved. There is undoubtedly contamination here with another elegiac practice, that of flattering the mother of the beloved (eg the *dulcis et aurea anus* of Tib. 1.6.57 ff.), here as a person pleasing to the poet in death.

For the ablative (*dolore*) governed by the verb *comitor*, cf. Ch. E. Bennett, "The Ablative of Association", *TAPhA* 36 (1905) 77 s.v. *comitor.*

comitata: with encomiastic force; the verb *comitor*, particularly in the form of the past participle with a passive sense, is used in most cases to refer to the entourage of a deity or some important person; McKeown (141 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.6.33, *non ego militibus venio comitatus et armis*) quotes Ov. *Met.* 2.441, *suo comitata choro Dictynna*; 845; 3.215; 10.9; *Fasti* 2.463; 4.425; 5.645; *ThLL* 3.1815.11 ff.; cf. also Ov. *Her.*

12 (*Medea Iasoni*).135, *iussa domo cessi natis comitata duobus*; Bömer 115 *ad* Ov. *Fasti* 2.463; 168 *ad* 3.366.

14 maereat: a peculiar construction of the verb *maerere*, for although from Cicero onwards in prose (cf. *Tusc.* 1.30, *nemo maeret suo incommodo*) and Virgil in poetry (cf. *Ge.* 3.518, *maerentem . . . fraterna morte iuvencum*) this verb is used intransitively with the ablative, the ablative always denotes a thing, not a person. Attempts have been made to explain this example of Lygdamus' by taking both *genero* and *viro* as datives, but suffice it to consider that in its transitive use, too, the designation of people is reduced to a few attested cases in poetry.

15–26: note how the accumulation of rituals acts described here forces Lygdamus into confused syntax and an abuse of temporal particles in his attempt to leave the chronological order clear: *ante*, l. 15; *ante*, l. 16; *primum*, l. 19; *mox*, l. 20; *post haec*, l. 21. The central ritual act is undoubtedly the *ossilegium* (ll. 17–18), which Lygdamus takes as the temporal axis of the description, as is shown by the fact that the preceding actions are qualified by the adverb *ante*, and the later ones by *primum*, *mox* and *post haec*.

15–16: the participial construction and the repeated *ante* make it clear that the rituals described in this distich occurred just before the *ossilegium* proper, as acts of propitiation in this connection: a propitiatory invocation and prayer to the spirits of the dead man, and purification of the hands that are to pick up the bones by washing with water. This is the only testimony that has come down to us of these preparatory rites. Undoubtedly *manes praefari* is a reference to a ritual invoking of the dead man's spirits distinct from that which took place at the moment of his death—the *conclamatio* or action of calling the deceased by his name over and over again to make sure he has really died (cf. Hom. *Od.* 9.65; Ter. *Eun.* 348; Prop. 4.7.23–24; Ov. *Tr.* 3.3.43; Serv. *Aen.* 6.218; Liv. 4.40.3; Apul. *Met.* 1.6; Toynbee, *Death and Burial*, pp. 44, 288 n. 119)—or else during the funeral procession (cf. Prop. 2.13.28), or at the final leavetaking, the last farewell—*ave*, *ave et vale*, or similar, followed by the name of the deceased and the ritual formula *sit tibi terra levis*—which marked the end of the funeral rites (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.231, *dixitque novissima verba*; Prop. 1.17.23–24, *illa meum extremo clamasset pulvere nomen, / ut mihi non ullo pondere terra foret*; cf. Ps.-Theoc. 23.44–45). When the dead man had died in battle, the ritual of the *conclamatio* was carried out over his empty tomb; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.505–6, *tumulum* (scil. *Deiphobi*) . . . *inanem / constitui* (scil. *Aeneas*) *et magna manis ter voce vocavi*. In this case

it might instead be the *ultima conclamatio*, which apparently occurred just before cremation (cf. Serv. *Aen.* 6.218, *post ultimam conclamationem comburebantur* [scil. *cadavera*]), or rather (with Tränkle 86) an invocation and prayer to the spirits of the dead man so that he will accept in good grace the picking—up of his bones which is to follow; that is, it may therefore be a propitiatory rite connected with the *ossilegium.* It was the general custom to call on the *manes* of the dead at ceremonies held in honour of the deceased in a desperate attempt to bring them back to life; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.303–4, *Andromache manisque vocabat / Hectoreum ad tumulum.*

For this use of the verb *praefari* in the sense of "to address a preliminary invocation to a deity or deities", cf. Cato *Agr.* 141.2, *Ianum Iovemque vino praefamino*; Verg. *Aen.* 11.301, *praefatus divos solio rex infit ab alto*; Ov. *Fasti* 6.304, *inde precando praefamur Vestam.* The pleonastic use of *praefatae ante* has been the subject of much debate, but it is important to bear in mind Lygdamus' taste for pleonasms (cf. 3.9, *permenso defunctus tempore lucis*; 4.47, *aevique futuri eventura*; 5.27, *vano nequicquam*). Another debated point is the impossible *rogat(a)e* which closes the hexameter (where *rogantes* is more to be expected), attested by the bulk of the mss. and the *edd. vett.* The great majority of editors since Cyllenius, Muretus, Heinsius (*ad* Ov. *Fasti* 6.303) and Broukhusius read *precat(a)e* with some *recentiores.* Among other proposed emendations, there is a certain amount of support for *recentem*, as proposed by Bach, followed by Postgate, Tränkle and Lee; cf. Ov. *Met.* 8.488–489, *vos modo, fraterni manes animaeque recentes* (= "souls of my recently departed brothers"), / *officium sentite meum.* Scaliger proposed the reading *animamque, rigatae / perfusaeque*, but the resulting pleonasm is extreme; Ach. Statius in his commentary proposes *togatae*, that is, dressed in the characteristic attire of prostitutes (?); cf. app. crit.

15 manes animamque: the same conjoint allusion to the *Di Manes* and the *animae mortuorum* is found in Hor. *Sat.* 1.8.29, (*ut*) *manis* (*-bus* Porph. *ad loc.*) *elicerent animas responsa daturas*; Ov. *Met.* 8.488 *sup. cit.* (with Bömer 154); Sil. 13.395, *excire . . . manis animasque suorum.*

manes: the manes are the collective spirits of the dead man; the term *manes* generally denotes «the beneficent and worshipful rather than the maleficent and dangerous spirits of the dead» (Frazer 37 *ad* Ov. *Fasti* 5.421); however, in spite of their affable nature, it is they who possess the right to decide on life and death: hence the need to placate them; cf. Verg. *Ge.* 4.189; *CLE* 542.1; 1034.3; Marbach, *RE* 14.1051 ff.; Steuding in Roscher II, pp. 2316–2323; Wissowa, *RuK*[2],

pp. 238 ff.; W. F. Otto, *Die Manen*, 1923; Lattimore, *Themes in Epitaphs*, pp. 90–95 (§ 17); Walde-Hofmann, *LEW* II, pp. 26 ff.; K. Latte, *Römische Religiongeschichte*, Munich 1960, p. 99; Nisbet-Hubbard 70 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 1.4.16; Radke 195–198; *OCD* 643 s.v.

16: purification by water. Being clean and tidy is an external symbol of purity, and a preliminary requisite for the proper carrying-out of any religious ceremony; cf. Tib. 2.1.13–14, *casta placent superis: pura cum veste venite / et manibus puris sumite fontis aquam;* Ov. *Fasti* 5.435, *manus puras fontana perluit unda.* Cleansing of the hands by water in religious ceremonies originally represented freedom from violent crimes in particular, though later the ceremonial became formalized; cf. Sen. *Contr.* 1.2.14; D. R. Shackleton-Bailey, *Propertiana*, 1956, p. 293. For the motif of *purae manus*, cf. also Pl. *Amph.* 1093–1094, *invocat deos . . . manibus puris;* [Verg.] *Catal.* 14.6; Prop. 2.32.28, *testis eris puras, Phoebe, videre manus;* Ov. *Met.* 9.702–703, *puras . . . ad sidera suppplex / Cressa manus tollens* (with Bömer 487); *Fasti* 3.335, *si tua contigimus manibus donaria puris;* Sen. *Nat.* 3 *praef.* 14, *puras ad caelum manus tollere;* *Oed.* 790–791, *licet iam tollere ad caelum pie puras nec ulla scelera metuentes manus.*

pias . . . manus: the phrase *pia manus* is frequent in poetry from Verg. *Aen.* 3.42 and 4.517; cf. eg Val.-Flac. 2.600; Sen. *Oed.* 226. The adjective *pius* applied to the hands is explained here in that the hands are those with which Neaera and her mother are to pick up Lygdamus' bones, thus fulfilling an obligation of piety. The syntagma *manu* + adjective reappears three times in Lygdamus (5.20, *mala . . . manu/*; 30, *lenta . . . manu/*; 6.6, *prona . . . manu/*); cf. also Ov. *Met.* 1.200, *manus impia;* 3.731 (of Agave tearing to pieces her son Pentheus), *manibus . . . nefandis;* *Tr.* 3.9.16 (of Medea), *nefanda manu.* The forms *manu* and *manus* regularly occupy the end of the pentameter. Of the 25 occasions on which the term appears in the genuine Tibullus, it does so in pentameters on 23, and only twice in hexameters (1.7.29; 1.10.65). Of the 22 appearances of the forms *manu* and *manus*, 19 are at the end of a pentameter, 2 in mid-pentameter (1.5.64; 2.1.78), and only one in mid-hexameter (1.7.29). The form *manibus* appears 3 times; twice in pentameters (1.2.92; 2.1.14), once in a hexameter (1.10.65). On the procedure of attributing to *manus* (or the like) epithets which strictly characterize the person to whom the hands belong (enallage), see McKeown 166 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.7.3–4, *temeraria bracchia . . . / . . . vesana . . . manu/*. Ovid makes more use of this poetic device than any other author: (eg *Am.* 1.11.14 *blanda;* 14.36 *maesta;* 2.6.39 *avara;* 9.12 *pigra;* 14.24 *crudelis;* 18.16 *privata;* 3.6.36 *irata;* 58 *insana;* 71 *inimico*

pollice; 8.22 *hoc fassas . . . manus*; 9.10 *infesta*; cf. also *ThLL* 8.350.18 ff.; Lausberg §§ 506–527; Hofmann-Szantyr 159–160 (§ 93).

liquore: ie *aqua*, already in Lucretius (eg 1.713; 771; 1084); cf. *ThLL* 7.2.1439.3–46.

17–18: the ritual act of *ossilegium* (Gr. ὀστολόγιον or ὀστολογία), an obligation of piety which fell on the principal mourner; cf. Hom. *Il.* 23.252–253; 24.793–794, ὀστέα λευκὰ λέγοντο κασίγνητοί θ' ἑταροί τε / μυρόμενοι; *Od.* 24.72; Lex Tab. in Cic. *Leg.* 2.60, *homini mortuo ne ossa legito, quo post funus faciat*; Verg. *Aen.* 6.228, *ossaque lecta cado texit Corynaeus aeno*; Tib. 1.3.5–6, *mater / quae legat in maestos ossa perusta sinus*; Prop. 1.17.12, *ossaque nulla tuo nostra tenere sinu*; 22, *molliter et tenera poneret ossa rosa*; 2.24.50, *vix venit, extremo qui legat ossa die*; 4.1.127–128, *ossaque legisti non illa aetatae legenda / patris*; Ov. *Met.* 8.539, *post cinerem cineres* (= *ossa, favilla*) *haustos ad pectora pressant* (with Bömer 169; *ossa haurire* = *ossa colligere*); 13.424–426; Sen. *Dial.* 4.33.6; 12.2.5; Mart. 4.33.4, *tempus erat iam te, Sosibiane, legi* (with wordplay in *te . . . legi*: "for your books to be read" or "for your bones to be collected"); 8.57.5, *ossa licet quondam defuncti non legat heres*; Suet. *Aug.* 100.2, *senatorum humeris delatus in campum crematusque;* ***reliquias legerunt*** *primores equestris ordinis ac mausoleo condiderunt*; Serv. *Aen.* 11.210; *CLE* 1149.3 Buech., *flevit praesentem mater, flevere sodales, / et mater tepido condedit ossa rogo.* Two nights could pass between the actual death and the rite of *ossilegium*, since the normal practice was for the ritual enshrouding to occupy the first night and for the funeral pyre to be burning throughout the second, as a result of which the bones must have been collected "on the third day" after death; cf. *CIL* 10.1935 (= Dess. 7841d), *Chrematine, Numisiae ornatrix, obieit VI eidus Octobr. Paullo Fabio Maximo Q. Aelio cos., ossua conlecta IV idus Oct. eisdem cos.*; Serv. *Aen.* 11.210, *mos enim erat tertia die ossa crematorum legi.*

On this peculiar funeral rite, cf. Blümner, *Römische Privaltertümer*, p. 487; G. Rohde, "*ossilegium*", *RE* 18.2 (1942) 1599–1602; Vahlen, *Opuscula* II, pp. 491 ff.; Toynbee, *Death and Burial*, p. 50.

As regards the formulation of the hexameter, cf. on the one hand Ov. *Ars* 1.769, *pars superat coepti, pars est exhausta laboris*, and on the other Ov. *Am.* 1.15.42, *pars . . . mei multa superstes erit* (with n. by McKeown 421); for the pentameter, cf. Catul. 64. 307–308, *vestis / candida purpurea talos incinxerat ora*, and Ov. *Fasti* 5.217, *convenit pictis incinctae vestibus Horae.* Note once again Lygdamus' preference for colour contrasts, here, as in l. 10, between the whiteness of the *ossa* and the blackness of death, represented in l. 10 by the ashes, and here by

the mourning dress (*nigra vestis*). Against the funereal black, his white bones (the pallor of love?) stand out in stark contrast. The twofold black/white colour contrast suggests a symbolic meaning for the colours rather than the use of simple superfluous epithets: namely, black for death and white for love (cf. the commentary on Lygd. 1.9 *lutea*).

legant . . . spargant: the reading *legent* (l. 18) . . . *spargent* (l. 19), unanimously transmitted by the oldest mss., is quite unsustainable. Although the future may occasionally be used to express a wish one is fully confident will be carried out, the subjunctive which is unavoidably implied by *parent*, l. 20, and with which the two verbs are closely associated, makes it advisable to take the reading *legant . . . spargant* of the *recentiores* as the correct one.

17 pars quae sola mei superabit corporis: somewhat recherché periphrasis for *reliquiae*, the term normally used in the context of funerals to denote specifically the remains of the body after cremation; cf. Pacuv. *Trag.* 200; Serv. *Aen.* 2.539, *funere: cadavere: ab eo quod praecedit id quod sequitur. Funus enim est iam ardens cadaver: quod dum portatur exsequias dicimus: crematum reliquias: conditum iam sepulcrum* (= Isid. *Orig.* 11.2.35); Austin 105 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 6.227; Sen. *Her. O.* 1756, *reliquias magni Herculis* (= 1823); 1829; Suet. *Aug.* 100.2 (*sup. cit.*); Vahlen, *Opuscula* II, pp. 494–495. This Lygdamean expression could well belong to the language of epitaphs; cf. *CLE* 14.2 (= *ILS* 7460; *ILLRP* 805), *quoius corporis reliquiae quod superant sunt in hoc panario*; 1247.1, *quod superest homini, requiescunt dulciter ossa* (and perhaps also *CLE* 543.9; 2288.4, both defectively transmitted).

superabit: for *superare* in the sense of *superesse*, cf. eg Lucr. 1.790; Verg. *Ge.* 1.189; 2.235; 331; 3.63; *Aen.* 12.873; Hor. *Poet.* 328; [Verg.] *Aetna* 386; Prop. 4.2.57; Ov. *Met.* 3.470 (with Bömer 563); 7.510; *Her.* 10.147, *hos tibi, qui superant, ostendo maesta capillos*; *Fasti* 1.460; *Ponto* 1.3.14; Manil. 4.358; Stat. *Theb.* 10.326; *OLD supero* 7.

18 incinctae: ie *discinctae, non cinctae, tunicis recinctis*, as Némethy 41 (*ad loc.*) correctly observes, for in religious ceremonies there should be nothing tied or bound; cf. Serv. *Aen.* 2.134, *piaculum est in sacrificiis aliquid esse religatum*; 4.518, *in sacris nihil solet esse religatum*; 6.48; Tib. 1.5.15, *velatus filo tunicisque solutis* (with Smith 295); Ov. *Met.* 7.182–183, *egreditur tectis vestes induta recinctas, / nuda pedem, nudos humeris infusa capillos*; in connection with the ritual of *ossilegium*, cf. Suet. *Aug.* 101, *reliquias* (scil. *Augusti*) *legerunt primores equestris ordinis tunicati et discincti pedibusque nudis*; J. Heckenbach, "De nuditate sacra sacrisque vinculis", *RVV* 9.3, Giessen 1911. «*Incinctus* igitur—continues Némethy 41–42—

"hoc loco non significat succinctum, sed discinctum, cuius significationis hucusque unum exemplum erat notum apud Isid. *Orig.* 10.151, de muliere gravida: "*Incincta,* i.e. sine cinctu, quia praecingi fortiter uterus non permittit", unde Gallice mulier gravida vocatur *enceinte.* Ego addo Ov. *Fasti* 5.675, *huc venit* **incinctus** *tunicam mercator,* ubi agitur de mercatore festo Mercurii sacris operante et ob id ipsum discincto, quod fugit interpres». But, as S. Allen ("Némethy's *Tibullus* and *Lygdamus*", *CR* 20 [1906] 455) points out, this interpretation of *incinctae* is not an original one on the part of Némethy, but had already been put forward by J. P. Postgate in his *Selections from Tibullus and Others* (London 1922^2), p. 127: «*Incinctae,* with their robes ungirded. Suet. *Aug.* 101 tells us that Augustus' ashes were gathered up by the principal members of the equestrian order in ungirdled tunics, *tunicati et discincti pedibusque nudis*... This word has usually the sense of "girded", and so most edd. take it here. But the evidence of facts and probability tends another way. The Romans would be well acquainted with the ceremonies which Lygdamus is describing; and, even if the negative compound had never been used before, it would have no ambiguity for them. Compare Luc. *Civ.* 7.787, *et* **iniustis** *ossa medullis,* where no one could fail to see that *iniustus* means "*un*burnt", thought it occurs nowhere else in this sense. But there is reason to believe that *incinctus* "ungirded" was in vulgar use, as Isidore assigns this sense to explain *incincta,* a pregnant woman, whence is derived the Fr. *enceinte*». Even before Postgate, F. A. Paley had surmised along the same lines (*P. Ovidii Nasonis Fasti,* London 1860, *ad* Ov. *Fasti* 5.675 *sup. cit.*): «*Incinctus* Gierig [Leipzig 1812] takes here for *cinctus,* and Keightley [London 1839] compares *incinctos Lares* (2.634). Perhaps it means "ungirt", with the tunic allowed to fall low, for so the *institores* or pedlar merchants dressed, as we know from Prop. 5(4).2.38, *mundus demissis institor in tunicis.* As in the middle ages, the Roman merchants had a distinctive dress; and are said to have carried a purse at their girdles». This suggestion of Paley's—as Allen *l.c.* recalls—was quoted by G. H. Hallam in his edition of (London 1881). Tescari, too, reflects this interpretation of *incinctae* in the translation of his edition of 1951: «le candide ossa nella nera veste discinte raccolgono (p. 223)». *Suum cuique.* For *incinctus* (*in* + *cinctus*), cf. *ThLL* 7.1.911.48–55.

nigra candida: for colour contrasts in Lygdamus, cf. l. 10 (comm.).

nigra... veste: «ablativus non cum *incinctae,* sed cum *legant* est iugendus: legant ossa mea veste nigra i.e. in vestem; solebant enim lugentes ossa in sinum vestis suae legere et Lygdamus procul dubio

imitatur Tib. 1.3.5–6, *non hic mihi mater, / quae legat in maestos ossa perusta sinus* (Némethy 42)»; it was also taken thus by Tescari 223 (*sup. cit.*).

In the Republican period the Romans wore black, dark or grey clothing at funerals, as *tristia insignia lugentium*; cf. Serv. *Aen.* 3.64, *caeruleis vittis Cato ait, deposita veste purpurea, feminas usas caerulea cum lugerent. Sane 'caeruleum' nigrum accipiebant*; Varro in Non. 549.30; 550.1. This funerary use of black is reflected in Augustan and post-Augustan literature in general; cf. Prop. 4.7.28, *atram . . . togam*; 4.11.97, *lugubria sumpsi*; Ov. *Met.* 8.448, *auratis mutavit vestibus atras*; 11.48–49, *obstrusaque* (vel *oscuraque*) *carbasa pullo / Naides et Dryades* (in mourning for Orpheus); 11.669; *Tr.* 4.2.73; Sen. *Dial.* 4.2.5; 12.16.2; Juv. 3.213; 10.245; Mart. 14.157.1, *pullo lugentes vellere lanas*; Tac. *Ann.* 3.2, *atrata plebes*; Fest. p. 236 M., *praetexta pulla*; Venul. *Dig.* 47.10.39, *vestis sordida*; D. C. 55.8.5; 56.31.3, φαιὰ στολή; Plut. *Cic.* 35, ἐσθὴς φαιά; Dionys. 5.17. However, there are indications that in Imperial times, perhaps as a result of the luxury that was the order of the day, white was now looked down upon, becoming the colour of mourning, at least among women; cf. Plut. *Qu. Rom.* 26 p. 270 D.; Herodian. 4.2.3. Surprising, however, is the statement of the jurist Paulus that mourners must refrain from wearing white (Paul. *Sent.* 1.21.14, *qui luget, abstinere debet a conviviis, ornamentis, purpura et alba veste*); this apparent contradiction can be overcome by taking the prohibition of white clothing to refer only to men. Be that as it may, the fact is that the old custom was later returned to (cf. Lact. *Mort.* 39, *adhuc in atris vestibus erat mulier nondum luctus tempore impleto*). Apparently, during the period of mourning women changed the toga for the *ricinium*, a simple kind of square shawl; cf. Varro in Non. p. 542M, *mulieres in adversis rebus ac luctibus, cum omnem vestitum delicatiorem ac luxoriosum postea institutum ponunt, ricinia sumunt*; p. 549M; Cic. *Leg.* 2.59; 64. On Roman mourning practices, cf. Kübler, *RE* 13.2 (1927) 1698.49–1699.39 s.v. *luctus*.

19–20: the burial honours, consisting of libations of milk and wine on the incinerated remains of the dead man before burial, also for the purpose of putting out the ashes on the pyre (*restinctio cinerum*). On the offering of wine in connection with cremation, cf. Hom. *Il.* 23.250, πρῶτον μὲν κατὰ πυρκαϊὴν σβέσαν αἴθοπι οἴνῳ; 24.791; Verg. *Aen.* 6.226–228, *postquam conlapsi cineres et flamma quievit / reliquias vino et bibulam lavere favillam / ossaque lecta cado texit Corynaeus aëno*; Prop. 4.7.34, *fracto busta piare cado* (with Fedeli 195); Stat. *Silv.* 2.6.90–91, *nec quod tibi Setia* (ie *vinum*) *canos / restinxit cineres*; Auson. 1.120.20 v

(Loeb), *sparge mero cineres bene olentis*; Petr. *Satyr.* 77.7, *Stiche, profer vitalia, in quibus volo me efferi; profer et unguentum et ex illa amphora gustum, ex qua iubeo lavari ossa mea*; Toynbee, *Death and Burial*, p. 50. As for offerings of milk at blood sacrifices (often together with others of wine and honey) there are frequent references in Latin literary texts (cf. *ThLL* 7.2.817.9 ff.); however, apart from the present passage of Lygdamus, the only testimony in Latin of a ritual offering of milk on recently-incinerated corpses is Stat. *Theb.* 6.212, though even in this passage it is a Greek custom that is reflected. In Verg. *Aen.* 5.77–78, *duo rite mero libans carchesia Baccho / fundit humi, duo lacte novo, duo sanguine sacro*, the context is the burial honours to celebrate the anniversary of the death of Anchises; in *Aen.* 3.66, *inferimus tepido spumantia cymbia lacte*, the reference is strictly to an offering of milk on the funeral altar set up in honour of the deceased Polydorus, not on his cremated corpse, for there was none, what was buried in an urn being his soul (*animamque sepulcro / condimus*, ll. 67–68); here again, it is almost certainly a Greek tradition that is being depicted. As a Roman tradition proper we only have evidence for the offering of milk to the dead in *CIL* 11.1420 (= *ILS* 139.21–22) and, clearly related to the present distich, in Lygd. 5.33–34, *promittite Diti / et nivei lactis pocula mixta mero*. In any case, according to Plin. *Nat.* 14.88, *Romulum lacte, non vino, libasse*, libations of milk at Roman burial ceremonies must have been normal in legendary times, while offerings of wine were forbidden. Here, however, it is the reverse, with offerings of milk apparently being the unusual practice, as can be inferred from *etiam* (l. 20). As rhetorical hyperbole it is a topos of funeral poetry that the dampening of the ashes is occasionally done by means of tears, instead of wine, water or milk, as was normal practice; cf. E. *Or.* 1239; [Theocr.] 23.38; Hor. *Od.* 2.6.23; Verg. *Aen.* 6.227; Prop. 2.1.77; Mart. 1.88.6; Stat. *Silv.* 2.6.86–93, *exhausit flamma . . . / . . . / Assyrio manantes gramine sucos / et domini fletus: hos tantum hausere favillae, / . . .*; 5.2.32.

primum . . . mox: "first . . ., then". This correlation expresses a temporal sequence between two actions, the second occurring shortly after the first; for the first time in Ov. *Met.* 1.577–581; 8.504; 13.607; 14.70 ff.; 15.555–556; there is also *primo . . . mox* in Verg. *Ge.* 4.309–310, *animalia . . ., trunca pedum primo, mox et stridentia pinnis* (cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 4.176, [*Fama*] *parva metu primo, mox sese attollit*; Ov. *Met.* 2.336; Quint. *Inst.* 1.9.2, [*condiscant*] *versus* ***primo*** *solvere,* ***mox*** *mutatis verbis interpretari*; *i.a.*); *prima . . . mox* in Ov. *Met.* 3.107–109, ***prima****que de sulcis acies apparuit hastae, / tegmina* ***mox*** *capitum . . . /* ***mox*** *umeri pectusque*

onerataque bracchia telis / existunt; *prius* . . . *mox* in Ov. *Fasti* 1.619 ff.; in prose, from Liv. 28.25.3–4); cf. *ThLL* 8.1550.9 ff.

19 annoso: the adjective *annosus* to refer to wine is first attested in Ov. *Ars* 2. 410, *annoso* . . . *mero*; cf. also Lygd. 6.58, *temperet annosum Marcia lympha merum*. Statistics for *annosus* (following Bömer 263 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 7.237): Verg. 3 (*Aen.* 4.441; 6.282; 10.766); Hor. 3 (*Od.* 3.17.13; *Ep.* 2.1.26; *Sat.* 2.3.274); Tib. 0; Prop. 2 (2.25.5; 4.8.3); Ov. 10 (*Ars* 1.14; 2.418; *Met.* 7.237; 8.743; 12.357; 13.517; 799; *Fasti* 2.571; 5.144; *Tr.* 5.2.11); from Plin. *Nat.* 4.89 it is also attested in prose.

collecta: it picks up the *legant* of the previous line (*derivatio*), but it is not just a use of the compound verb for the simple, as Tränkle 88 would have it; rather, the preverb here retains its whole force ("brought together"). See Lygd. 2.26 *componi* (comm.).

Lyaeo: *Lyaeus*, "the liberator" or "he who loosens (worries)"—from the Gr. λύω = *solvere*, "to untie"; cf. Plut. *Mor.* 680 B.; *Etymologicum Magnum* 571.17; Frisk *GEW* II 149—is one of the common titles of Dionysus, also known as Bacchus, god of the vineyard and wine, of mystic delirium and poetic inspiration. In Rome he soon became identified with the old Italic god *Liber Pater*, a country deity. This assimilation was undoubtedly aided by the association *Lyaeus* = *Liber*. This liberating quality of the wine-god explains Horace's phrase *libera vina* (*Poet.* 85), "the wine that gives freedom".

Bacchus is accorded this epithet of *Lyaeus* in literature (though never before the Hellenistic Age); it is not an intrinsic element of the cult. It is apparently first attested in the middle of the 3rd c. BC, in Leonidas of Tarentum (*AP* 6.154); in Latin, first in Enn. *Scen.* 123–124, *his erat in ore Bromius, his Bacchus pater, illis Lyaeus vitis inventor sacrae*; several times in Virgil and Horace; frequently in Ovid (with Bömer 48 *ad* Ov. *Fasti* 1.395). The poetic metonym *Lyaeus* = *vinum* is first attested in Horace (cf. *Epod.* 9.37–38, *curam metumque* . . . *iuvat / dulci Lyaeo solvere*, with play on the etymology; *Od.* 1.7.22 *uda Lyaeo / tempora* [with Nisbet-Hubbard 104]; cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 1.686, *laticem* . . . *Lyaeum*; Prop. 3.5.21, *multo mentem vincire Lyaeo* [note the etymological contrast with *vincire*]; Ov. *Am.* 2.11.49, *illic adposito narrabis multa Lyaeo*; *Ars* 3.645, *fallitur et multo custodis cura spargent Lyaeo*; Petr. *Satyr.* 135.8, l. 7) and is parallel to the metonymic use which also occurs with *Liber* (cf. Naev. *Pall.* 122, *Liberum* . . . *obsorbuit*; Hor. *Od.* 4.12.14; Ov. *Ars* 3.101; *i.a.*) and especially *Bacchus* (from Lucr. 2.656; 3.221, *Bacchi* . . . *flos* ["the 'bouquet' of wine"]; cf. also Verg. *Ge.* 1.344, *favos* . . . *dilue Baccho*; 4.380, *cape Maeonii carchesia Bacchi*; *Aen.* 3.354, *pocula Bacchi*

[= Ov. *Fasti* 3.301]; Tib. 1.2.3, *multo percussum tempora Baccho*; 2.5.87, *madidus Baccho* [with Murgatroyd 221]; Prop. 1.3.9, *ebria* ... *multo* ... *Baccho*; *Paneg. Mess.* 57, *victa Maroneo* ... *lumina Baccho*; Ov. *Met.* 4.765, *generosi munere Bacchi*; 6.488, *Bacchus in auro*; 7.450, *Bacchi* ... *haustus* [with Bömer 312]; 12.578, *repetito munere Bacchi*; 13.639, *cum liquido* ... *Baccho*; Sen. *Oed.* 157; Luc. *Civ.* 1.609; *Mart.* 13.119.1; Lygd. 6.5, *madeant generoso pocula Baccho*; 6.57, *Naida* (= *aquam*) *Bacchus amat*; *OLD Bacchus* 2b; *ThLL* 2.1665.78 ff.). For the literary periphrasis *munera Bacchi* = *vinum*, cf. comm. *ad* Lygd. 6.17–18. One further step is the combination of antonomasia and metonymy in the mannered formula *auctor muneris* = *Bacchus* = *vinum* in Ov. *Met.* 11.125, (*Midas*) *miscuerat puris auctorem muneris undis* (with n. by Bömer 271). This metonymic use for *vinum* or *merum*, explained by the fact that Bacchus-Lyaeus-Liber is the god of wine, is part of a wide-ranging metonymic phenomenon affecting a good many more deities in the Roman pantheon, by means of which a god's name or epithet goes on to designate the object under his protection (eg *Ceres* = *frux*, *panis*, *cibus*; *Neptunus* = *mare*; *Venus* = *amor*; *Vulcanus*, *Vesta* = *ignis*). The Roman authors themselves inform us of this phenomenon; cf. *Rhet. Her.* 4.43; Cic. *De or.* 3.167; Quint. *Inst.* 8.6.24, *fruges Cererem appellamus, vinum autem Liberum*; cf. Lausberg, *Retórica Literaria* II, pp. 71–72 (§ 568); Gross, *De metonymiis sermonis Latini a deorum nominibus petitis*, Diss. Halens. XIX 4 (1911), pp. 342 ff. (for *Bacchus*). Note, too, the daring metonymic phrase in Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.41 (on Hercules, brother of Dionysus), *multo fratre madentem* (with Laguna 143); 4.6.56–57, *tenet haec* (= *manus*) *marcentia fratris / pocula*. It should be observed that, alongside *Lyaeus*, the other names of Dionysus are also found in Lygdamus: *Bacchus* (cf. 4.44 [comm.]; 45; 6.5; 17; 57), *Lenaeus* (cf. 6.38 [comm.]) and *Liber* (cf. 6.1 [comm.]; 19). The most comprehensive list of the epithets of Bacchus is to be found in Ov. *Met.* 4.11–17. In fact, this diversity in the titles of the wine-god is a common characteristic of Lygdamus and Ovid; Tibullus, on the other hand, only uses *Bacchus* (1.2.3; 4.7; 37; 7.39; 41; 9.34; 61; 2.1.3; 55; 3.63; 64; 5.87); cf. G. Baligan, "Ancora su Ligdamo", *Aevum* 24 (1950) 283 n. 1.

20 niveo ... lacte: the phrase *niveum lac* first appears in Verg. *Ecl.* 2.20; cf. also Ov. *Fasti* 4.151; Lygd. 5.34, *et nivei lactis pocula mixta mero*.

fundere: here in the sense of the compound *perfundere* ("to sprinkle, pour over, soak"); cf. Tib. 1.7.50, *multo tempora funde mero*.

21–22: after the libations of milk and wine, the bones had to be dried with a linen cloth (l. 21) before being placed in the urn (l. 22).

This is the only testimony that has come down to us of this drying of the bones.

21 post haec: an expression of time that is no stranger to elegiac language (cf. Tib. 1.5.6), given the impossibility of inserting the cretic *pōstĕā* into dactylic metre and the common tendency in the elegiac poets to avoid the anaphoric pronoun *is-ea-id* and replace it with the demonstrative pronoun *hic-haec-hoc*; cf. Fedeli 195 *ad* Prop. 1.7.13. The adverb *post* only reappears in Lygdamus in 6.32.

umorem tollere: a poetic periphrasis for *siccare*, no doubt to avoid repetition in the *sicca* of the next line (22).

carbaseis . . . ventis: Lygdamus wishes his bones to be wiped "with fine linen cloths". This expression is undoubtedly a variation on the more frequent *ventus textilis* which refers to fabrics which are so fine that they seem like the wind, as described by Petronius in *Satyr.* 55.6. l. 15; cf. also Publ.-Syr. *Mimi* 17, *aequum est induere nuptam ventum textilem, palam prostare nudam in nebula linea?*. It is therefore reasonable to think that in the expression *ventus textilis* the adjective could be replaced by *carbaseus*, since *carbasus* is an extremely fine type of linen (cf. Serv. *Aen.* 3.357), which would fit in well with Syrus' image *nebula linea*. Moreover, the comparison of very fine cloth with the wind appears as early as the *Homeric Hymn to the Sun* (*H. Hom.* 31.14, χαλὸν δε περὶ ξροῖ λάμπεται ἔσθος λεπτουργές, πνοιῇ ἀνέμων); cf. also Ov. *Met.* 6.20, *vellera . . . nebulas aequantia.* Within the description of a funeral as luxurious and heart-rending as the present one, it is by no means strange that Lygdamus should wish to have his bones wiped with some delicate cloths of fine linen. The reading *velis* of the later mss. and early editions, followed by Tränkle 88 with barely any discussion, must be rejected. Although several literary testimonies (cf. Cic. *Verr.* 6.30 and 80; Marcian. *Dig.* 39.4.16.7) show that *carbasea vela* was a common term to refer to fine cloth (for *vela* in the general sense of "cloth", rare in classical Latin, cf. also Plin. *Nat.* 35.150; [Verg.] *Ciris* 35; Ov. *Am.* 1.14.6, *vela colorati . . . Seres habent* [with McKeown 366–367]; *OLD* s.v. 5), it is precisely this—its prosaic and technical tone—that favours a poetic variant like *carbasei venti*, quite apart from the difficulty in explaining a corruption of *velis*, 'lectio facilior', into *ventis*, the unanimous reading of the oldest mss. and 'lectio difficillima' for anyone unfamiliar with the usage of Petronius and Syrus and accordingly unaware of the use of the term *ventus* to refer to fine cloth. As for other proposed readings, Ach. Statius regards as likely the reading of some mss. *vittis*, which—in his view—

could have been corrupted into *ventis* by the older spelling *veittis*; Voss emends to *linis* (cf. Prop. 4.3.64, *carbasa lina*) or *villis* (cf. Verg. *Ge.* 4.377).

umorem: a poetic term to refer to any liquid, here wine (*Bacchi Massicus umor* in Verg. *Ge.* 2.143) and milk (*lacteus umor* in Ov. *Met.* 15.79).

22 marmorea . . . domo: by this expression Lygdamus is probably referring to the marble burial urn which was to house his bones and ashes (*olla ossuaria* or *cineraria*). Apart from this passage and [Albinov.] *Liv.* 73–74, *claudite iam, Parcae, . . . sepulcra . . .; plus iusto iam domus ista patet*, in no other literary text is the term *domus* applied to a funerary monument (*sepulcrum*). However, this denomination is quite frequent in the epitaphs of the end of the Republic and the Imperial period, for the first time in *CLE*, *heus oculo errante quei aspicis leti domus, morare gressum*, particularly frequent being the combination *domus aeterna* (eg *CLE* 434.15 [Pisaurum], *haec domus aeterna est, hic sum situs, hic ero semper*; *CIL* 1.1930); cf. *ThLL* 5.1.1979.27–60; Lattimore, *Themes in Epitaphs*, pp. 165–167 (§ 41), with numerous quotes on p. 167 n. 78; Bömer 24–25 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 10.34 (*domus ultima*). This use of *domus* can be explained by the popular notion of the tomb as the dead man's dwelling, as shown in Petr. *Satyr.* 71.7, *valde . . . falsum est vivo quidem domos cultas esse, non curari eas, ubi diutius nobis habitandum est.* This passage of Petronius also explains the term *aeterna*; cf. also, by way of contrast, the wordplay in Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.237–238, *domus ista, domus! quis triste sepulcrum dixerit?*. There is a striking contrast between this *marmorea domus*, a luxury reserved for the burial-place of a wealthy Roman, and the humble *parvula testa* which is to house the remains of Propertius in 2.13.32 (*acciat Manis parvula testa meos*) or the *parva urna* of Ov. *Tr.* 3.3.65 (*ossa tamen facito parva referantur in urna*). While the bones and ashes of the lowly were contained in earthenware pots, glass jars or, at best, in simple lead caskets, the incinerated remains of well-to-do Romans rested in finely-wrought urns made of marble or, occasionally, alabaster (cf. Toynbee, *Death and Burial*, p. 253). For the unusual phrase *marmorea domo*, cf. Ov. *Met.* 14.441–442, *urnaque Aeneïa nutrix / condita* ***marmoreo***, and also *CIL* 13.2104.7, *domus saxea.* On the different types of receptacles for the ashes, see Toynbee, *Death and Burial*, p. 50.

ponere: ie *sepelire* ("to bury"), from the simplification of expressions like *<terra> ponere* or *<in sepulcro> ponere* (as can still be seen in Ov. *Met.* 8.236, *hunc* [= *Dedalum*] *miseri tumulo ponentem corpora nati*

[= *Icari*]; 9.504); cf. Lucr. 3.871, *ut . . . putescat corpore posto*; Verg. *Aen.* 6.508, *te . . . nequivi . . . patria decedens ponere terra*; Ov. *Ars* 3.740, *hoc faciet positae te mihi, terra, levem*; *Fasti* 5.479–480, *lucemque . . . illam qua positis iusta feruntur avis*; *Met.* 14.619–620, *eodem / monte iacet positus* (with Bömer 198); [Albinov.] *Liv.* 69, *posito Agrippa*; Prop. 1.17.20, *si . . . ultimus et posito staret amore lapis*; Quint. *Inst.* 7.9.5, *si quis corpus suum in culto loci poni iubet*; cf. Shackleton Bailey, *Propertiana* (Cambridge 1956) 51 *ad* Prop. 1.17.20; Fedeli 412 *ad* Prop. 1.17.20; *OLD pono* 8b.

23–25: these lines deal with the offerings of perfume and the tears shed over the bones and ashes of the deceased, now placed in the burial urn. For the tribute of tears, cf. E. *Or.* 1239, δακρύοις κατασπένδω σε; Gow-Page 412 *ad* [Theocr.] 23.38, ἐπισπείσας δὲ τὸ δάκρυ; Nisbet-Hubbard 105 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 2.6.22–24, *ibi tu calentem / debita sparges lacrima favillam / vatis amicis*; Prop. 2.1.77; Bömer 184 *ad* Ov. *Fasti* 3.560; Citroni 278 *ad* Mart. 1.88.6 (for the poetic hyperbole of damping the ashes with tears, see the comm. on ll. 19–20).

As regards the offerings of perfumes or aromatic essences in general, the topic is dealt with in Roman literature in association with different moments of the burial procedure. Apart from the anointing (as distinct from embalming) of the corpse with unguents and perfumes while it is laid out in public in the atrium of the house, no doubt in order to counteract the stench of putrefaction (cf. Pers. 3.103–105), mention is made of aromatic offerings after the funeral procession and just before cremation (cf. Prop. 2.13.29–30, *osculaque in gelidis pones suprema labellis / cum dabitur Syrio munere plenus onyx*; Ov. *Ponto* 1.9.51–54, *ille tibi exsequias et magni funus honoris / fecit et in gelidos versit amoma sinus, / diluit et lacrimis maerens unguenta profusis / ossaque vicina condita texit humo*; *Fasti* 4.853; Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.33–34); during the cremation itself, they are sprinkled on the funeral pyre (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.224–225, *congesta cremantur / turea dona*; Prop. 4.7.32; Stat. *Silv.* 2.6.86–93; Mart. 10.26.6); also on the ashes and bones shortly before the tomb is closed (cf. Tib. 1.3.7, *soror, Assyrios cineri quae dedit odores*; Ov. *Tr.* 3.3.69, (*ossa*) *cum foliis et amomi pulvere misce* [with Luck 182]; Stat. *Silv.* 2.1.157–162 [with van Dam 148]; 4.34–35, *Assyrios cineres adolentur amomo / et tenues Arabum respirant gramine plumae*), and on the stone, once the tomb has been closed, as a funeral offering (cf. Prop. 3.16.23; Ov. *Fasti* 3.561 [with Bömer 184]; Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.212; Aus. *Epit.* 31.1–2; Prud. *Cath.* 10.171–172; *AP* 11.8.1 [Anon.]). This custom of burning spices with the corpse is a typically Roman (not Greek) one; for more on this practice, see Mayor 234 *ad* Juv. 4.109; Blümner,

Privataltertümer, 501; Hug, *RE* 1A (1920) 1857; 1862; G. Rohde, "*ossilegium*", *RE* 18 (1942) 1599–1602; K. Schneider (E. Stemplinger), *RAC* 1 (1950) 395; J. Esteve Forriol, *Die Trauer- und Trostgedichte in der römischen Literatur* (München 1962) 144 § 44C, 146 § 46I; Lilja, *Odours*, pp. 88 ff. The non-fulfilment of this pious obligation to provide aromatic honours was a serious failing on the part of the dead man's relatives; cf. Prop. 4.7.32, *cur flammae nardo non oluere meae?*; Pers. 6.34–35, *urnae / ossa inodora* (*inhonora* α) *dabit, seu spirent cinnama surdum / seu ceraso peccent casiae nescire paratus* (with Jahn; Kißel 811–812).

In poetry, it is always exotic perfumes and oriental spices that are referred to, (a comprehensive catalogue can be found in Stat. *Silv.* 2.1.157–162; 5.1.210–216; Mart. 11.54.1–3): saffron from Cilicia (*crocum*), *costum* from India, Arabian myrrh (*myrrha*), Egyptian cinnamon (*cinnamum*), balsam from Palestine (*opobalsamum*), frankincense from Somalia (*tus*), and *amomum* and *malobathrum* imported from Syria. Of all these, the funeral perfume par excellence for the Romans was the balsam extracted from amomum with which they sprinkled the corpses, believing in its power to bestow immortality, and linking this to the myth of the Phoenix (cf. Tib. 1.3.7; Prop. 2.13.29–30; Ov. *Tr.* 3.3.69; *Ponto* 1.9.51–54; Stat. *Silv.* 2.4.34; 6.88; for the myth, Ov. *Met.* 15.392–393; Tac. *Ann.* 6.28; Lact. *Phoenix*; J. Hubaux-M. Leroy, *Le mythe de Phénix . . .*, Liège 1939). On the subject of spices in the Roman world, see the exhaustive study by J. I. Miller, *The Spice Trade of the Roman Empire (29 B.C. to A.D. 641)*, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1969.

For the motif of the mixture of perfumes and tears, cf. Ov. *Fasti* 3.561, *mixta . . . lacrimis unguenta*; *Ponto* 1.9.53, *diluit et lacrimis maerens unguenta profusis*; Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.211–213, *semper odoratis spirabunt floribus arae, / semper et Assyrios felix bibet urna liquores / et lacrimas, qui maior honos.* Both types of offering are also depicted as closely related in Tib. 1.3.7–8, *cineri . . . dedat odores / et fleat . . . ante sepulcra*; Stat. *Silv.* 2.6.86–93.

Here again, as in the rest of this elegy, we are faced with syntax that is particularly harsh and crude, since alongside two different subjects (*merces*, *lacrimae*) for the same verb (*fundantur*), we find two different adverbs of place (*illic*, *eodem*) with the same reference (*in marmorea . . . domo*). The long relative clause occupying a whole distich is no more than a poetic periphrasis to say the same as Propertius says in 2.13.30 in two words, *munere Syrio*, and it follows very familiar models, like Tib. 2.2.3–4, *odores, quos e terra divite mittit Arabs*, where it is also used to indicate the origin of perfumes and the same poetic

use is made of *mittit* in the sense of "to export" (cf. Verg. *Ge.* 1.57, *India mittit ebur* [with Mynors 13]; Hor. *Epod.* 5.22, *herbas . . . quas Iolcos . . . mittit*; Prop. 3.13.5; Ov. *Ars* 3.213; Juv. 6.466).

23–24 dives: the coarse repetition of *dives*, which demonstrates the limitations in Lygdamus' poetic gift, has consistently seemed suspect to scholars of all periods. As a result, in the most recent of the mss. preserved, the *dives* of one or other line is replaced by *pinguis*, which might seem reasonable if we consider Hor. *Od.* 2.12.22, *pinguis Phrygia*; Verg. *Ge.* 2.139, *Panchaia pinguis*; Prop. 3.5.5, *Campania pinguis*; and Mart. 6.11.7, *pinguis Gallia*. However, we must not forget Lygdamus' penchant for the repetition of words in close proximity (cf. 3.33–34, *faveas . . . / et faveas*) or even the repetition of formulas (cf. ll. 10 *candidaque ossa super nigra favilla teget* and 17–18, *ossa / incinctae nigra candida veste legent*); cf. Vahlen, *Opuscula* I, p. 359. Besides, if it comes to substituting, which *dives* are we to choose? The above-cited Virgilian precedent may suggest replacing the *dives* of the hexameter; however, cf. Tib. 2.2.3–4, Ov. *Met.* 10.307 and Sen. *Phaed.* 67, all of these passages reproduced above, where the adjective of wealth associated with *Panchaia* is *dives*.

23 Panchaia: the land that is "all good" (Gr. Παγχαΐα < πᾶν-χάϊος, according to Hesychius), was originally a more or less imaginary island in the Indian Ocean, where the Greek Euhemerus locates his Utopia (*FGrHist* 63). Pliny, however, makes it a region of Arabia Felix (*Nat.* 7.197; cf. Mela 3.81, *Rubri maris . . . partem Panchaii habitant*), an extremely fertile producer of incense and spices. Nevertheless, the reference to it here in conjunction with Eastern Arabia and Assyria suggests that Lygdamus may be mentioning Panchaia as a concrete reality, distinct from Arabia, and may still picture it as a real isle of spices. In fact, of the five species of Arabian incense, considered by Strabo to be the "most perfect incense" (Str. 16.4.19), only one is native to the continent, four originally coming from Socotra, an island situated at the end of the horn of Africa, opposite the mouth of the Red Sea, and identified by Miller (*Spice Trade*, p. 103) as Virgil's *Panchaia*. On the wealth of incense of Panchaea (χώρα Λιβανωτοφόρος), in addition to other spices and eastern perfumes, cf. Lucr. 2.417, *ara . . . Panchaeos exhalat . . . odores*; Verg. *Ge.* 2.139, *turiferis Panchaia pinguis*; 4.379, *Panchaeis adolescunt ignibus arae*; [Verg.] *Cul.* 87, *Panchaica tura*; Ov. *Met.* 10.307–310, *sit dives amomo, / cinnamaque costumque suum sudataque ligno / tura ferat floresque alios Panchaia tellus, / dum ferat et myrrham* (with Bömer 119); 478; Apul. *Mun.* 35,

civitatem . . . spirantem Panchaeis odoribus. The *Historia Sacra* of Euhemerus was translated into Latin by Ennius, hence the frequent mentions of Panchaea by Latin others. The scansion *Panchāĭă* (n.) and *Panchāĭŭs* (adj.) is attested in Verg. *Ge.* 2.139; Claud. *De III cons. Honorii* 211; *Pros.* 2.81; [Verg.] *Cul.* 87; Ov. *Met.* 10.309; on the other hand, *Panchǣŭs* occurs in Lucr. 2.417; Verg. *Ge.* 4.379; Ov. *Met.* 10.478. On this fabulous island, cf. Konrat Ziegler, "Panchaia", *RE* 18.3 (1949) 494–495; *Idem*, "Panchaia", *Der Kleine Pauly*, p. 450.

24 Eoique Arabes: the Arabian Peninsula was divided by Ptolemy into three regions: *Arabia Petraea, Deserta* and *Felix*. Arabia exported incense and myrrh, gold and precious stones, and re-exported Indian spices and other products. The main trading routes were the "Incense Road" from Sabbatha through Medina, Dedan and Petra to Syria, and the routes from Dhofar to Gerrha, from Gerrha across the desert to Petra, and from Egypt to Babylonia via Jauf (for the trading routes from Asia and eastern Africa with the Mediterranean in Antiquity, cf. Miller, *Spice Trade*, pp. 119–152). Until the Augustan period, the Arabs from the south were zealous intermediaries in the maritime trade between India and Egypt. Later, Roman Egypt, by means of direct journeys to the south of Arabia and to India and through maritime predominance in the Red Sea, broke this Arabian monopoly, with the consequent decline in the importance of the "incense route". The main spice from Arabia was incense (Plin. *Nat.* 12.51, *tura praeter Arabiam nullis, ac ne Arabiae quidem universae*). For this and other native spices of the Arabian peninsula (*balsamum* from Palestine, and myrrh), cf. Hdt. 3.107 ff.; D. S. 2.49; 3.46; Arr. *An.* 7.20.2; Verg. *Ge.* 1.57, *mittit . . . molles sua tura Sabaei*; *Aen.* 1.416–417; Plin. *Nat.* 12.51 ff.; Mela 3.79; Prop. 2.29.17; Miller, *Spice Trade*, pp. 101–105.

Undoubtedly, Lygdamus is referring here to *Arabia Felix* (Sabaea), so called for its great riches, and today Yemen (cf. Plin. *Nat.* 12.51, *Arabiae divitias. . . . causasque quae cognomen illi felicis ac beatae dedere*); however, this can be deduced from the context of the aromatic essence-producing regions in which it is cited, and not from the term *Eoi* that goes with it, and which here does not define a particular area of Arabia but simply indicates its eastern orientation as seen from Italy; above all, this term is used as a synonym for *dives*, since the wealth of the Orient had become proverbial for the Romans. For the expression, cf. Verg. *Ge.* 2.115, */Eoasque domos Arabum.* On this land's wealth in aromatic spices, in addition to the *loci* above

mentioned, cf. Pl. *Truc.* 540, *ex Arabia tibi attuli tus, Ponto amomum*; Tib. 2.2.3–4, *odores / quos tener e terra divite mittit Arabs* (with Murgatroyd 73); Sen. *Phaed.* 67, *Arabs divite silva*; *Oed.* 117, *cinnami silvis Arabas beatos*; Mart. 3.65.6, *Eoo ture*; Stat. *Theb.* 1.263, *turis Eoi.* On the proverbial wealth of the Arabians, cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.29.1, *Icci, beatis nunc Arabum invides / gazis* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 339); 2.12.24, *plenas aut Arabum domos*; 3.24.1–2, *intactis opulentior / Thesauris Arabum et divitis Indiae*; *Ep.* 1.7.36, *otia divitiis Arabum liberrima muto*; Prop. 1.14.19, *illa neque Arabium* (= *divitium*) *metuit transcendere limen* (with Fedeli 331); Sen. *Herc. O.* 793, *dives . . . Arabs*; Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.61, *Arabumque potentes / divitias*; cf. Otto, *Sprichwörter*, pp. 33–34 s.v. *Arabs*; for Roman Arabia in general, see *RE* 2.1 359 (Rohden); *OCD* 91 s.v.; G. W. Bowersock, *Roman Arabia*, Cambridge: Mass. and London, 1983. Note that the passages cited reveal that the fame of Arabia as a land of fabulous wealth is only attested in Rome from the beginning of the Augustan period—Horace apparently being responsible for introducing the literary topos—until the end of the 1st c. AD.

Ēoi: with the first vowel long (Gr. ἠῷος), as in Tib. 2.2.16; [Tib.] 3.8.20; Prop. 1.15.7; 16.24; 2.18.8; 3.13.15; 4.3.30; 5.21; Luc. *Civ.* 1.252; 2.55; it can also be short (Gr. ἑῷος), as in Prop. 3.24.7; 4.6.81; Luc. *Civ.* 4.66; 352; 5.71 (with Barratt 28); 6.52. Both possibilities concur in Prop. 2.3.43–44, *ostendet Eois / uret et Eoos.* See Serv. *Aen.* 2.417, *notandum sane, quod, cum 'Eous' 'e' naturaliter longum habeat, metri necessitate correptum est propter sequentem vocalem.*

Ārabes: Lygdamus here uses *Arabes* with -*ā* in the first syllable. On the varying length of the initial syllable of the words *Arabs*, *Arabius*, *Arabia* and the like, cf. Demetr. *Rhet. Gr.* 3.270.28 ff. Spengel; W. Schulze *Quaest. ep.* 153; Fedeli 331 *ad* Prop. 1.14.19; Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, p. 53.

Assyria: the name applied by Herodotus (1.178, 185; *i.a.*), Xenophon (*Cyr.* 2.5) and later writers (Pliny) to the region delimited by the mountains of Armenia and Iran and the Syrio-Arabian desert. In 116 AD Trajan relegated Assyria to the status of province of the Roman Empire, but at that time it only covered the remains of the Sassanid Empire, i.e. Lower Mesopotamia or Babylonia, including Ctesiphon. In the time of Hadrian it was abandoned by the Roman legions (cf. *OCD* s.v.). The wealth of Assyria in aromatic products is referred to in Catul. 68.144, *fragrantem Assyrio . . . odore domum*; Hor. *Od.* 2.11.16, *Assyria . . . nardo . . . uncti*; Verg. *Ecl.* 4.25, *Assyrium vulgo nascetur amomum*; Tib. 1.3.7, *Assyrios . . . odores*; Mart. 8.77.3, *Assyrio . . .*

amomo. Curiously, this is the only appearance of the name *Assyria* (as opposed to *Syria*) in the whole of Latin poetry. In prose it appears for the first time, and then on numerous occasions, in the Elder Pliny's *Natural History* (5.66; 11.75; *i.a.*) and then also in Tacitus (*Ann.* 12.13, *urbs Ninos, vetustissima sedes Assyriae*). For the perfumes of Syria, see Gow *ad* Theocr. 15.114; Ellis *ad* Catul. 6.8. There were Italian and Greek perfumes, but the best and most expensive were those imported from the East, where the main centres of the perfume industry were to be found (cf. Plin. *Nat.* 13.1 ff.).

25 nostri memores lacrimae: "tears in my memory", a daring and original expression. The personifying application of this adjective is very frequent in the whole of Roman literature, both in connection with animals (cf. Verg. *Ge.* 3.316, *[caprae] memores*) and objects (cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.14.18, *cadum Marsi memorem duelli*), as well as abstract concepts (cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.11.51–52, *nostri memorem sepulcro / scalpe querellam*; Prop. 1.6.35, *mei . . . non immemor hora*; 1.11.5, *nostri . . . memores ducere noctes*; Ov. *Ponto* 3.2.30, *si . . . a memori posteritate legar*) and, in particular, with parts of the human body (cf. Cic. *Planc.* 80, *memori mente*; Catul. 64.23, *memori . . . corde*; Ov. *Her.* 19.98, *memori aure*; *Ponto* 1.4.56, *memori . . . manu*; Juv. 11.28, *memori pectore*). However, the adjective had never previously been applied to tears as it is here. Regarding the funeral context of *memores* as a recollection of the deceased in the mind of the living, a close parallel is Ov. *Ponto* 1.4.56, *tura . . . Caesaribus . . . memori debita ferre manu*, and also Hor. *Od.* 3.11.51–52, the latter passage (cited above) being one which must have made a notable contribution to the spread of the formula in necrological contexts, as is attested by the use of the last two lines of the Horatian ode in a funerary inscription in verse dating from the time of Trajan and engraved on the pyramid of Gizeh (*CLE* 270.3 Bücheler = *CIL* 3.8.21):

> *Vidi pyramides sine te, dulcissime frater,*
> *et tibi quod potui lacrimas hic maesta profudi*
> *et* ***nostri memorem*** *luctus hanc* ***sculpo querelam.***

As for *nostri*, it is the partitive genitive governed, to a certain extent in the archaic period and predominantly in classical times, by verbs of remembering (*memini*) or forgetting (*obliviscor*), and also by analogous adjectives (*memor*, *gnarus*, etc.) or expressions (*mihi in mentem venit*). Cf. Ernout-Thomas 45, Kühner-Stegmann II.1.437.

The same phrase, *nostri memores*, can be found in Prop. 1.11.5 and

Hor. *Od.* 3.11.51, cited above, and Lygd. 5.31, *memores . . . vivite nostri*, where again a certain note of farewell in light of the proximity of death can be felt.

26: this line closes the part of the elegy devoted to instructions on the form the burial should take while the ashes have not yet been placed in the urn (*cinere insepulta*).

sic: refers to ll. 11–25.

componi: "to be buried", the verb being used in its literal sense, since the ashes and bones had to be collected and placed together in a funeral vessel or urn (*con-ponere*). This poetic sense of *componere* (= *sepelire*) is first attested in Catul. 68.98, *nec prope cognatos compositum* (scil. *Catulli fratrem*) *cineris* (with Fordyce 354); cf. also Hor. *Sat.* 1.9.28, *omnes composui* (with Lejay 237–238; Kiessling 148); Verg. *Aen.* 1.249, *nunc placida compostus pace quievit*; Prop. 2.24.35–36, *tu mea compones et dices: "ossa, Properti, / haec tua sunt: . . ."*; Ov. *Fasti* 3.546–547, (*Dido*) *arserat exstructis in sus fata rogis / compositusque cinis*; 5.425–426, *exstincto cineri sua dona ferebant / compositique nepos busta piabat avi*; 480, *positis iusta feruntur avis*; *Met.* 4.157, *componi tumulo eodem*; 7.444, *composito Scirone*; *Ponto* 1.2.109–110, *nec male compositos . . . cineres*; Val.-Flac. 7.203; Luc. *Civ.* 1.568, *compositis plenae gemuerunt ossibus urnae*; Petr. *Satyr.* 114, *nos imprudens harena componet*; Sil. 9.95, *furtiva cupiens miserum componere terra*; Stat. *Silv.* 3.5.13 (with Laguna 355); *CLE* 373.3, *hic ego nunc iac[eo] fatis compostus [i]niqu[is]*; 1001.5, *compositos . . . cineres humus tegat oro*; 1144.8, *me . . . bene compositum fata sivere mea*; *AL* 455.2; it seldom appears in prose (cf. eg Tac. *Hist.* 1.47, *Pisonem Verania uxor . . . Titum Vinium Crispina filia composuere*); cf. *OLD compono* 4c; *ThLL* 3.2116.22 ff. Occasionally, *componere* is used in connection with the funeral rite of the enshrouding of the corpse; first in Ov. *Met.* 9.503–504, *peream, precor, ante toroque / mortua componar, positaeque det oscula frater* (with Bömer 430); cf. also Pers. 3.104–105, (*mortuus*) *compositus lecto crassisque lutatus amomis / in portam rigidas calces extendit* (with Jahn 164; Kißel 480 n. 205); Sen. *Dial.* 10.20.3, *componi se in lecto*; *ThLL* 3.2116.36 ff.; Mau, *RE* 3.348.39 ff.

Here, once again, we observe Lygdamus' taste for the interplay between simple and compound, *ponere* (l. 22)/ *componi*, like *legent* (l. 18)/ *collecta* (l. 19), though in both cases the compound fully preserves the added value of the preverb. For the use of the simple *ponere* in this sense, cf. eg Prop. 1.17.22, *poneret ossa*; Ov. *Tr.* 3.3.70, *inque suburbano condita* (scil. *ossa*) *pone solo* (with Luck 182); for the simple/compound *derivatio* in the context of a funeral, cf. Ov. *Met.* 9.504 (*sup. cit.*).

versus in ossa: a syntactic construction parallel with *mutatus in umbram* (l. 9), although the two expressions indicate a different point in time: *mutatus in umbram* evokes the very instant of death, when Lygdamus the person abandons his body, now a corpse, and becomes a shade; *versus in ossa*, on the other hand, refers to the moment when the inanimate corpse, once incinerated, is reduced to mere bones. All the same, the phrase we might have expected, to refer to the moment after incineration, is *versus in cinerem* or *cineres* (cf. eg Prop. 2.13.31, *ubi suppositus cinerem me fecerit ardor*; Ov. *Tr.* 3.3.83, *quamvis in cineres corpus mutaverit ignis*); *versus in cineres* is, moreover, the usual expression to refer to the result of being consumed by flame (cf. eg Hor. *Ep.* 1.15.39; Tib. 1.9.12; Ov. *Her.* 1.24, *versa est in cineres sospite Troia viro*; *Met.* 2.216; *Tr.* 5.12.68, *in cineres Ars mea versa foret*; Aug. *Civ.* 16.30, *tota illa regio . . . in cinerem versa est*; *CLE* 1038.5; *ThLL* 3.1073.3–7). Here Lygdamus has been forced to vary the formula *metri causa.*

velim: the clearly optative nuance in *velim* colours the optative element in the other subjunctives in the passage (ll. 11–26).

27–30: one last command from Lygdamus concerning his funeral although, unlike the previous ones, it has nothing to do with his remains, but the form of his tomb: Lygdamus expresses a wish that a stele should be placed on his tomb facing the most frequented zone, with an epitaph relating the cause of his death, his love for the woman who has been taken away from him. The model for this motif of the inscription on the tomb is Tib. 1.3.54–56, *fac lapis inscriptis stet super ossa notis: / «hic iacet immiti comsumptus morte Tibullus, / Messallam terra dum sequiturque mari»*. For the topos of *amor* as *causa mortis*, cf. Bömer 402–403 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 7.855, *causam mihi mortis, amorem.*

27: it was an age-old custom to indicate the cause of death on funerary monuments, either in praise of the deceased or to elicit pity for him; cf. Lattimore, *Themes in Epitaphs*, pp. 142–158 (Ch. IV: "Causes of Death"). The mention of the *causa mortis* here, in its erotic facet as an elegiac topos, follows the well-known model of Dido's epitaph in Ov. *Her.* 7.195–96, *praebuit Aeneas et causam mortis et ensem; / ipsa sua Dido concidit usa manu*, taken up again and varied by Ovid himself in *Fasti* 3.549–550 and *Ars* 3.39–40. The link with this model reinforces the threat of suicide that is latent in this elegy. Moreover, the Ovidian model is not limited to Dido; cf. Ov. *Her.* 2.145–148 (Phyllis Demophoonti), *inscribere meo causa invidiosa sepulcro; / aut hoc aut simili*

carmine notus eris: / «Phyllida Demophoon leto dedit hospes amantem; / ille necis causam praebuit, ipsa manum»; *Met.* 9.563 (Byblis ad Caunum), *neve merere meo subscribi causa sepulcro!* (with Bömer 446).

sed: *sic* in some early editions (cf. app. crit.).

mortis . . . causam: for the Ovidian expression *causa mortis*, cf. Ov. *Her.* 7.195 (*sup. cit.*); 18.200, *et 'mortis' dices 'huic ego causa fuit*; *Ars* 3.40; *Met.* 5.174–175; 7.855 *sup. cit.* (with Bömer 402–403); 10.380; *Fasti* 3.549; *Ponto* 1.2.15, *qui, mortis saevo geminent ut vulnere causas*; 4.6.11–12, *causamque ego . . . mortis . . . me reor esse tuae*; in prose, cf. Cic. *Phil.* 9.3; Cels. 7.197; cf. also the poetic variants *leti causa* in Ov. *Am.* 2.10.30 and *Her.* 20.175, and *necis causa* in Ov. *Her.* 2.148; cf. *ThLL* 3.674.84 ff. Absolutely unparalleled is the combination *causa perire* in l. 30 (comm.).

demonstret: hic haud dubie translate *exponat* vel *explicet*, non proprie *ostendat* vel *indicet digito, manu, nutu aliove gestu.* A clear prose usage, as the *Thesaurus* explains: "Vox inde a Plauto per omnem latinitatem viguit, sed a poetis plerumque evitata" (*ThLL* 5.1 503.55–56). Evidence for the poetic use of the verb *demonstrare* is rare and only very isolated; cf. Catul. 55.1–2, *oramus, si forte non molestum est, / demonstres, ubi sint tuae tenebrae*; Prop. 3.16.15, *luna ministrat iter, demonstrant astra salebras* (with Fedeli 504); [Verg.] *Aetna* 463, *sub terra murmur demonstrat et* (*denuntiat* Jacob, followed by Goodyear 185) *ignes*; in Silver Latin, Stat. *Theb.* 12.220, *demonstrat proxima quisque*; *Ach.* 1.582; cf. also *ThLL* 5.1 503–509; Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, p. 69. There is therefore nothing unreasonable about the attractive variant *designet* of the *codex Caesaraugustanus*, where the etymological sense of the verb *designare* ("to trace out" > "to reveal", "point out") fits rather well with the real inscription which Lygdamus orders to be engraved on the stone («notis, litteris, aliisque signis aliquid notare», *ThLL* 5.1.715.83 ff.). In any case, the manuscript tradition is too unanimous to invalidate it.

littera: "tombstone inscription, (poetic) epitaph", as in Ov. *Met.* 11.706, *in . . . sepulchro . . . iunget nos littera* (with Bömer 421); *CIL* 14.2852, *cuius ne taceat memorandum littera nomen*; simply as "inscription" in Ov. *Ars* 2.500; cf. *OLD littera* 6b; *ThLL* 7.2.1528.5 ff. This poetic use of *littera* as a collective singular ("sign") already appears in Lygd. 1.12 (comm.).

28: among the different formulations for the introduction of epitaphs into poems by the Augustan and post-Augustan poets, the closest is [Verg.] *Cul.* 411–12, *fronte locatur / elogium, tacita firmat quod littera voce.*

The same wish to have the epitaph placed on the most visible part of the *cippus* (or *lapis*) *sepulcralis*, that is, the side facing the public thoroughfare, is expressed by Cynthia in Prop. 4.7.83–84, *hic carmen media dignum me scribe columna, / sed breve, quod currens vector ab urbe legat.* Propertius, on the other hand, expresses the opposite wish in 3.16.25–30, *di faciant, mea ne terra locet ossa frequenti, / qua facit assiduo tramite vulgus iter: / post mortem tumuli sic infamantur amantum. / me tegat arborea devia terra coma, / aut humer ignotae cumulis vallatus harenae: / non iuvat in media nomen habere via.*

celebri: ie *frequens, frequentatus, populosus* ("busy"). It is not a very frequent adjective in poetry, except in Ovid (around 27 times). Of its two main meanings, the present is only attested in Augustan poetry in Hor. *Ep.* 1.17.28, *celeberrima per loca vadet*, and Ovid (cf. *Am.* 3.13.4; *Her.* 20[19].223; *Ars* 1.97; 2.705; *Met.* 1.446; 8.625; 10.270; 13.696; *Fasti* 3.713; 4.391; 5.102; 474; 6.477; *Ponto* 1.9.25); cf. also Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.232, *pars immensae gaudet celeberrima Romae*; *ThLL* 3.737.81 ff. The meaning *clarus, celebratus*, on the other hand, is already attested in Horace (*Od.* 2.12.20) and Tibullus (2.1.33; 83; [Tib.] 3.10.23); and, apart from Ovid (eg *Her.* 5.3; *Met.* 1.690; 747; 3.339; 5.412; 6.165; 8.159; 13.261; *Fasti* 1.601; 4.13; 343; *Ponto* 2.10.49), seldom found in the Silver Age poets; cf. [Albinov.] *Liv.* 146; Stat. *Ach.* 1.735; Sil. 4.186; 12.121; 14.197; 15.701; Mart. 7.47.1; Juv. 7.3; Auson. 399.2 Peiper; *Mos.* 403; *ThLL* 3.739.18 ff.

carmina: ie *epitaphium*. For *carmen* applied to *inscriptiones votivae* or *sepulchrales*, cf. Cic. *Senect.* 61, *carmen incisum in sepulcro*; Verg. *Ecl.* 5.42; *Aen.* 3.287; Prop. 2.14.26; 28.43; 4.7.83; Ov. *Am.* 2.6.60; *Her.* 2.146; 5.28; 7.194; 21.109; *Met.* 2.326; 9.793; 14.442; *Fasti* 3.548; Plin. *Nat.* 35.58; 115; 36.12; Sil. 9.266; 15.491; Sidon. *Ep.* 2.8.2, *saxo carmen saxum contineri*; *CLE* 112.10; 592.5 (593.5); 889.2; 990.9; 1017.3; 1191.4; 12.; 1357.1; *ThLL* 3.465.74–446.4.

notet: ie *signet, inscribat*; cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.4.20, *verba notata mero*; *Met.* 9.522, *damnat tabellas et notat et delet*; *Ponto* 3.4.26, *venisset verbis charta notata tribus.* Frequently *notae* even means "letters"; cf. Tib. 1.3.54, *lapis inscriptis . . . notis.*

29–30: with this epitaph the elegy closes and also reaches its climax (the end of the poem is made to coincide with the end of the poet's life). In addition, it provides the poem with a ring structure, since it clearly refers back to the ideas presented in the 1st part of the elegy (ll. 1–8); in particular, *coniugis ereptae* looks back to *erepta coniuge* (l. 4), *dolor* to *dolorem* (l. 3) and *dolor* (l. 6), and *perire* to *vivere* (l. 4) and

vitaeque . . . *taedia* (ll. 7–8). The epitaph in Lygdamus contains some clear epigraphic echoes: *hic situs est, dolor huic, cura* <*fuit*>, the name of the dead man and and the *causa mortis* (the loss of his wife).

Quotations from epitaphs (as well as from dedicatory and votive inscriptions) are frequent in Augustan poetry (eg Verg. *Ecl.* 5.42–44, *tumulum facite, et tumulo superaddite carmen: / Daphnis ego in silvis, . . .*"), and in particular in elegy, a genre which uses the metre that is most common in inscriptions; cf. J. G. Pallarès, "Poetas latinos como «escritores» de *CLE*", *CFC[Lat]* 2 [1992] 201–230. Among the many epitaphs which have been incorporated into the works of the elegiac poets (cf. eg Prop. 2.13.35–36; 4.7.85–86; Tib. 1.3.53–56; Ov. *Am.* 2.6.61–62; *Her.* 2.147–148; 14.129–130; *Tr.* 3.3.73–76), the one which is closest to Lygdamus here because of its erotic content is undoubtedly Ov. *Her.* 7.195–196 (= *Fasti* 3.549–550 and *Ars* 3.39–40), cited in the n. to l. 27. Note, in addition, the brief epitaph which Propertius, in one of his funeral fantasies, puts into the mouth of Maecenas at his own burial: *huic misero fatum dura puella fuit* (2.1.78). The roots of this type of erotic epitaph lie deep in Hellenistic poetry. Strikingly similar to the present elegy of Lygdamus is *Idyll* 23 of Pseudo-Theocritus (Ερaστὴς), where an unrequited lover, incapable of bearing any longer the scorn of his cruel beloved, opts for suicide; and, like Lygdamus, the *erastés* leaves instructions for his burial—where he imagines the gestures of tenderness and affection on the part of the ephebe which he did not enjoy when alive (ll. 35–45)—as well as his epitaph revealing the *causa mortis*, the cares of love (ll. 46–48):

> γράψον καὶ τόδε γράμμα, τὸ σοῖς τοίχοισι χαράξω·
> "τοῦτον Ἔρνως ἔκτεινεν. ὁδοιπόρε, μὴ παροδεύσῃς
> ἀλλὰ στὰς τόδε λέξον· ἀπηνέα εἶχεν ἑταῖρον."

For further striking echoes of this idyll in Lygdamus, see the commentary on Lygd. 1.28 *pallida Ditis aqua* (the water of Oblivion) and 4.73–74 *nescis quid sit Amor*; 85–94 (topos of insensitivity). For the considerable dissemination of epitaph technique through Ovid, an author who is prolific in this respect both in his erotic poetry and in his aetiological or mythological works (eg Ov. *Met.* 2.327–328; 9.793; 14.443), cf. Bömer 324–325 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.326.

On the idea of the beloved as being the one who is ultimately responsible for the joy or sadness of the elegist, cf. Prop. 1.11.25–26, *seu tristis veniam seu contra laetus amicis, / quidquid ero, dicam: 'Cynthia causa fuit'*.

29 Lygdamus: the only time the poet names himself. Propertius plays with this same name, that of a slave of Cynthia's (4.7.43, *Lygdamus uratur, candescat lamina vernae*); see Introduction, p. 21. Note the careful construction of this line, flanked by the two proper names.

hic situs est: stereotyped formula, particularly in funerary inscriptions, where the abbreviation *H. S. E.* can be read; cf. eg *CLE* 211; 363; 458; 461, *Suetrius Hermes hic situs est, cui Tertia coniunx / aram constituit digno meritoque marito*; 462; 463; 472; 480; 520; 646, *hic situs in tumulo*; 786; 1248; 1260, *hic situs Amphion ereptus prima iuventa*; 1320; 1322; 1372; 1818; *hic sita (est)* in *CLE* 211; 237; 387; 385; 445; 558; 560; 575; 857; 1023; cf. P. Colafrancesco-M. Massaro, *Concordanze dei CLE*, Bari 1986, pp. 762–763; and even in the Christian period; cf. *ICV* 63A (= *CLE* 1347); 2.590; 1129 (= *CLE* 688), *praesbyter hic situs est*; 1911 (= *CLE* 317).3 and thus frequently (cf. *ICV* vol. III pp. 591–592). It is equally well attested in the literary tradition; apart from the present passage of Lygdamus, cf. Enn. *Var.* 19, *hic est ille situs*; Ov. *Met.* 2.327, *hic situs est Phaethon* (with Bömer 325); Plin. *Ep.* 6.10.4; Luc. *Civ.* 8.793, *hic situs est Magnus*; cf. also Ov. *Tr.* 3.3.73, *hic ego qui iaceo*; E. Lissberger, *Das Fortleben der römischen Elegiker in den Carmina epigraphica*, Diss. Tübingen (1934) 132; *ThLL* 6.2754.77 ff.; *OLD situs* 2. The corresponding Greek formula, both in real and literary inscriptions, is ἔνθαδ' ἐγὼ κεῖμαι; cf. *IG* 12.9.287, ἔνθαδε Φίλον κεῖται (6th or 5th c. BC); Inschr. *AJA* 32 (1928) 179 ff. = Peek *GV* 350 = *GGG* 219 (3rd c. BC); *AP* 7.737, ἔνθαδ' ἐγὼ . . . κεῖμαι; 8.60 (Greg. Naz.); Inschr. *Not. Scav.* 20 (1923) 49, 96 = *GV* 394 = *GGG* 406 (3rd c. AD). Equally stereotyped formulas for epitaphs are *iacet hoc sepulcro* (cf. Mart. 11.91.1 [with Kay 255]; *CLE* 495; 555; 766; 1378; 1645; 1758; cf. also Mart. 11.13.7, *hoc sunt condita . . . sepulchro*) or the more synthetic *hic iacet* (cf. Tib. 1.3.55; *CLE* 425; 430; 442; 508; 548; 553; 556; 586; 596; 679; 687; 732; 753; 794; 1166; 1179; 1313; 1351; 1411; 1836).

dolor . . . et cura: for the combination in the context of love-sickness, cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.735–736, *attenuant iuvenum vigilatae corpora noctes / **curaque et**, in magno qui fit amore, **dolor***; *Met.* 10.75 (for Orpheus once Eurydice has been lost for ever), ***cura et dolor** animi lacrimaeque alimenta fuere.*

dolor: on the elegiac sense of this term, see the commentary on l. 3 *dolorem.*

cura: here equivalent in meaning to *amor*, but a love which causes *curae*; that is, "the anxiety of love". For the different senses of *cura* in

the *sermo amatorius*, cf. Lygd. 1.19 (comm.). Some editors read *causa*, since the mss. have *câ*, an abbreviation for both *causa* and *cura*.

Neaerae: objective genitive ("for, towards Neaera"). The combination *cura Neaerae* at the end of a hexameter is modelled on the formula *cura puellae/*, which is particularly frequent in Ovid; cf. eg [Tib.] 3.17.1; Prop. 3.21.3; Ov. *Am.* 1.9.43; *Her.* 21.61; *Ars* 2.295; 3.631; *Rem.* 681.

30 coniugis ereptae: for the phrase, see Lygd. 2.4 *erepta coniuge* (comm.).

causa perire: variant on the usual formula *causa mortis*, which appears in l. 27 (comm.). The combination *causa perire* (= 'pereundi'), in which an infinitive stands for a noun in an oblique case, is exceptional in archaic and classical Latin, since in similar circumstances the normal device is to use a gerund in the genitive (cf. Liv. 39.49.2, *ipsum . . . pudor relinquendi equites . . . tenuit*; Sen. *Dial.* 7.26.6, *ut pudor hominibus peccandi demeretur*; Kühner-Stegmann II.1.737 ff.; Hofmann-Szantyr 374–375 [§ 203 A]; Bassols I.394–395 [§ 414–415]). However, the infinitive is occasionally attested in the classical period; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.10–11, *sed si tantus amor casus cognoscere nostros* (*est*) / *et breviter Troiae supremum audire laborem*; 10.90–91, *quae causa fuit consurgere in arma / Europamque Asiamque et foedera solvere furto?*; Prop. 1.1.28, *sit modo libertas, quae velit ira, loqui*; Ov. *Her.* 1.109, *nec mihi sunt vires inimicos pellere tectis*. This construction originates from phrases consisting of noun + verb *esse* (of the type *consilium est*, *copia est*, *occasio est*, *tempus est*, etc.), which as early as the archaic period were construed with an infinitive since they implied verbs that habitually took the infinitive (*cupio*, *decet*, *expedit*, *licet*, *oportet*, etc.). In the post-classical period, however, this construction becomes more frequent, probably as a result of Hellenistic influence, although it remains a sporadic usage; cf. Luc. *Civ.* 5.463–464, *Hapso gestare carinas causa palus* (*est*); Sil. 4.329, *trepida . . . a mente recedit vertere* (= 'vertendi') *terga pudor*; for the infinitive as noun-complement, see Kühner-Stegmann II.1.742; Hofmann-Szantyr 351 (§ 192 b); Ernout-Thomas 269–270 (§ 280); Bassols I.359 (§ 379).

perire: with the hyperbolic meaning of "to die of love"; the verb is already frequently found in this sense in Plautus (eg *Poen.* 96; 1095); cf. also Catul. 45.5, *te perdite amo . . . quantum qui pote plurimum perire*; 100.2 (*depereunt*); Hor. *Od.* 1.25.7, *me tuo longas pereunte noctes, Lydia, dormis*; 27.12; Verg. *Ecl.* 8.41, *ut vidi, ut perii*; 10.10, *indigno cum Gallus amore peribat*; Prop. 1.4.12 (with Fedeli 144); 6.27, *multi longinquo perire in amore libenter*, 9.34; 13.33, *es periturus amore*; 15.41; 2.15.13; 24.41;

27.11; Ov. *Her.* 4.86; 12.33, *et vidi et perii*; *Rem.* 16; 21; cf. J. Svennung, *Catulls Bildersprache*, Uppsala 1945, p. 113; H. Heusch, *Das Archaische in der Sprache Catulls*, Bonn: Hanstein 1954, p. 74; R. J. Baker, "*Laus in amore mori*: Love and Death in Propertius", *Latomus* 29 (1970) 670–674; Pichon, p. 230 («*perire* . . . refertur . . . ad eos qui nimia cupidine uruntur»); *OLD pereo* 4.

III

This elegy combines and intermingles, in a somewhat disordered manner, a series of ideas, some purely elegiac and others characteristic of moral-philosophical sermons, producing a final mix which is very Tibullan: on the one hand, the pointlessness of praying to the gods, a complete disdain for wealth and the desire to lead a simple life, free from worries of all kinds and, on the other, the sublimation of the beloved as the source of all happiness, the wish to enjoy a long life by her side and the idea that death is preferable to living without her.

The "real" starting point for this elegy is Lygdamus' desire to win back the Neaera who has been taken from him. The line of thought is as follows: Lygdamus wishes to recover his beloved Neaera and in his desperation begs the favour of the gods. This leads him to stress that he is not appealing to the gods as others do, asking for riches, but in the desire that they will grant him a long and happy life together with his beloved (ll. 1–10). By way of justifying this atypical conduct, Lygdamus develops the well-known Cynico-Stoic diatribe about wealth not bringing happiness, to conclude in the elegiac manner by stating that true happiness—or wealth—stems from the beloved (ll. 11–32). Consequently, if the gods or fates do not deign to grant him this blessing of winning back Neaera and sharing a life of joy with her, Lygdamus, as a true elegist, opts for death (ll. 33–38).

The ψόγος of luxury dates back to great thinkers like Plato and Epicurus, but it was later vulgarized in the diatribes of the Hellenistic period. The moral diatribe of the Cynics was transferred into verse in the poetic compositions of Cercidas (c. 290–220 BC); cf. D. R. Dudley, *A History of Cynicism* [1937] 74 ff. Roman orators were fervorous in their denunciation of extravagance of all kinds, especially luxurious villas (cf. Cato *Or. Frg.* 174; 185, *dicere possum, quibus villae atque aedes aedificatae atque expolitae maximo opere citro atque ebore atque pavimentis Poenicis sient*; Plut. *Cat. mai.* 4.4). Similar ideas became part of the main current of Roman poetry in the 1st c. BC (Williams, *Trad. & Orig.*, pp. 578–619), particularly in Lucretius (cf. 2.20 ff.), the *Satires* of Horace, a good number of his *Odes* (2.15; 18; 3.1; 24; cf. Kroll, *WS* 37 [1915] 242 ff.; Nisbet-Hubbard *Od.* II 288–289),

and also in Virgil's *Georgics* (cf. 2.461 ff.), since contempt for luxury and praise of the simple life fitted in perfectly with Augustan ideology.

The elegiac poets, for their part, appropriated the Stoic ideal of the simple life (*paupertas*) not only as a kind of programmatic justification for their renunciation of the *cursus honorum* and their commitment to *ars gratia artis*, but also as a poetic device to emphasize the spiritual purity of their love (and their poetry) in contrast to the material nature of wealth, in particular that of the rich rivals (*divites amatores*) who became lord and master of their elegiac beloved (*avarae puellae*). This ideology left no room for imagining a life of luxury in the company of the beloved.

For the criticism of wealth and luxury in elegiac poetry, cf. C. E. Newlands, *Criticism of Wealth in Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid's "Amores"*, Columbia University: Ph.D. Dissertation, 1980; F. Navarro Antolín, *Amada codiciosa y Edad de Oro en los elegíacos latinos*, unpublished Tesis de Licenciatura, Universidad de Sevilla 1991 (shortened version in *Habis* 22 [1991] 207–221).

Although this elegy is very Tibullan in tone, Lygdamus, unlike the *Tibullus rusticus*, offers no description of what this simple life would really involve. For the idea that "poverty in happiness is preferable to wealth in misery" from the philosophical point of view, see in particular Sen. *Ep.* 90.41 ff.

The elegy consists of a series of τόποι, some philosophical, others purely elegiac, at first sight anarchically thrown together: the uselessness of prayer; the gods pay no attention to human affairs; *operosae divitiae*; wealth does not bring happiness; death is binding on all, rich and poor alike; wealth attracts envy; the *vulgus* unthinkingly covet an endless number of objects; the ups and downs of treacherous Fortune (*Fortunae rota*); elegiac *paupertas*; the superiority of *Amor* over *divitiae*; the loved one representing true happiness; he who is in love is rich; he who is in love is a king; the *elegiaca felicitas* of a long life spent with a faithful lover; death is to be preferred to a life without the beloved (elegiac suicide).

Race (*Classical Priamel*, p. 130) highlights the structure of this elegy, in which the topos 'not wealth, but love' is expressed by means of three priamels in succession (3–8; 11–23; 29–32).

* * *

1–10: a long sentence in which Lygdamus complains angrily (σχετλιασμός) that his pleas to the gods are in vain (ll. 1–2), although in them—he stresses—he is not requesting wealth (ll. 3–6), but the chance to enjoy to the very end a long life in the company of Neaera (ll. 7–10). In fact, this long-term wish conceals the real immediate aim of his plea, the return of his beloved—a *sine qua non* if his golden dream is to come true—although we do not discover this until l. 25 ff. As for the formulation, Lygdamus uses the typical rhetorical interrogative introduced by the formula *quid prodest . . .?* (or similar), the aim of which is to underline the pointlessness of a given action, here prayers to the gods, who according to Epicurean teaching have nothing whatsoever to do with human affairs. Note, too, how Lygdamus postpones the real content of his prayer or vow until ll. 7–10, with the idea of emphasizing how atypical it is when compared with the entreaties of most mortals, which are previously detailed (ll. 3–6). This is an example of the famous rhetorical device of the priamel (cf. Race, *Classical Priamel*, p. 130; Lygd. 2.1–8 [comm.]), the linguistic marker of which can be detected quite clearly: /*non ut* (l. 3) . . . / *aut ut* (l. 5) . . . /*sed* . . . *ut* (l. 7) . . . A similar structure based on purpose clauses can be observed in a priamel in Propertius, 2.13.5–8, / *non ut* . . . /*aut* . . . /*sed magis ut* . . ., or another in Horace, *Epod.* 7.5–10, /*non ut* . . . / . . . / . . . *aut* . . . *ut* . . . / . . . /*sed ut* . . . For the rejection of wealth similarly presented (*non* . . . *sed* . . .), cf. Archil. 19.1 W., οὔ μοι τὰ Γύγεω τοῦ πολυχρύσου μέλει; B. *Fr.* 21, οὐ βοῶν πάρεστι σώματ᾽ οὔτε χρυσός, / οὔτε πορφύρεοι τάπητες, / ἀλλὰ θυμὸς εὐμενής, / Μοῦσά τε γλυκεῖα καὶ Βοιωτίοισιν / ἐν σκύφοισιν οἶνος ἡδύς; Lucr. 2.24 ff.; Hor. *Od.* 1.31.3 ff. (with Nisbet-Hubbard 348); 2.18.1 ff. (with Nisbet-Hubbard 292–293); 3.16.33 ff.; Verg. *Ge.* 2.461 ff.; Maecen. *Frg.* 2 Morel; Prop. 3.2.9 ff.; Ov. *Am.* 1.3.7 ff.; Petr. *Satyr.* 135.8; Stat. *Silv.* 4.5.17 ff.

1 quid prodest . . .?: the anaphora which recurs throughout the elegy (cf. ll. 11; 13; 17–18, *quidve . . . iuvat?*) underlines the scepticism and impotence of the poet. For this topos of complaint or lament, cf. Hom. *Il.* 5.53–54, ἀλλ᾽ οὔ οἱ τότε γε χραῖσμ᾽ Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα / οὐδὲ ἑκηβολίαι; Hor. *Od.* 1.28.4–6 (with Nisbet-Hubbard 323–324); Prop. 3.18.11–12, *quid genus aut virtus aut optima profuit illi / mater et amplexum Caesaris esse focos*; 4.11.11–12, *quid mihi coniugium Paulli, quid currus avorum / profuit?* (with Fedeli 247–248); Tib. 1.2.77–78, *quid . . . recubare . . . prodest?*; 8.9, *quid tibi nunc molles prodest coluisse capillos / saepeque mutatas disposuisse comas / . . .?*; Ov. *Am.* 3.9.21, *quid pater Ismario quid mater*

profuit Orpheo?; *Met.* 2.589, *quid tamen hoc prodest* (= *Ponto* 3.3.57; *Nux* 147); 11.318–320, *quid peperisse duos et dis placuisse duobus / et forti genitore et progenitore Tonanti / esse satam prodest?*; [Albinov.] *Liv.* 41–42; *CLE* 543; *AP* 7.562.1–2 (Julianus), ὢ φθέγμα Κρατεροῖο, τί σοι πλέον εἴ γε καὶ αὐδῆς / ἔπλεο καὶ γιγῆς αἴτιον ἀντιπάλοις;

caelum votis implesse: for this poetic use of the verb *implere*, "to fill", "to overwhelm", cf. Verg. *Aen.* 9.480, *caelum . . . questibus implet*; Ov. *Met.* 7.427–28, *fovet ignibus aras / muneribusque deos implet*; [Albinov.] *Liv.* 23, *Gradivumque patrem donis implere parabat*; Val.-Flac. 2.167, *tum voce deos, tum questibus implent*; (for *impleo* in the sense of "to fill a place with sounds", if *caelum* is understood 'strictiore sensu' and not *metonimyce* for *deos* [see following n.], cf. Liv. 8.39.4, *urbem lamentis implere*; *ThLL* 7.1.629.74–630.5). There is a similar use of *onerare* in expressions like *onerare aliquem laudibus, promissis, praeceptis, iniuriis* (*ThLL* 7.1.632.63 ff.); cf. particularly Verg. *Aen.* 9.24, *multa deos orans, oneravitque aethera votis*; Amm. 29.1.38, *onerante questibus caelum.*

caelum: the term is frequently used in poetry with the meaning of "dwelling-place of the gods" (cf. *OLD caelum* 3a); in connection with prayers to the gods, it sometimes denotes by metonymy ('container for content'; cf. Lausberg, *Retórica Literaria*, p. 73 § 568.2), as it does here, the gods themselves (*caelestes*), considered collectively; cf. Serv. *Aen.* 8.64, *'caelo gratissimus amnis' pro his qui in caelo sunt*; Hier. *Is.* 13.13 p. 242, *caelum furiet . . .* μετωνυμικῶς *accipiendum pro his, qui versantur in caelo*; Naev. *Ep.* 24(25).1, *manusque susum ad caelum sustulit suas rex Amulius*; Lucr. 1.79, *nos aequat victoria caelo*; Ov. *Am.* 3.3.41–42, *quid queror et toto facio convicia* ***caelo****? /* ***di*** *quoque habent oculos,* ***di*** *quoque pectus habent*; Stat. *Theb.* 1.650, *quod si . . . saevo tanta inclementia caelo est*; Tac. *Hist.* 4.46, *caelum ac deos obtestari*; Fronto *Aur.* p. 222.25–26 Van den Hout (Brill 1954) = p. 238.7–8 Van den Hout (Teubner 1988), *caelum . . . consalutabo discedens*; cf. also *OLD caelum* 3b; *ThLL* 3.94.27–79. The noun *aether* is used similarly, for *sedes deorum* (*ThLL* 1.1151.31–55) and *metonymice* for *dei ipsi* (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 9.24, *oneravit . . . aethera votis*; *OLD aether* 1c; *ThLL* 1.1151.55–60).

votis: a *votum* was the vow made to a god to do or offer him something in return for a previously granted favour (cf. *OLD* s.v. *votum*); cf. Lygd. 3.33; 4.53.

implesse (**dedisse**, l. 3): with impersonal verbs or verbs used impersonally, in the Augustan poets and the elegists in particular, the perfect infinitive is frequently used with the force of an aorist for simple metrical convenience (especially in the 2nd half of the pen-

tameter), with little or no distinction in meaning as compared with the present infinitive. Working in favour of this tendency was its archaizing tone (the perfect infinitive was already used in archaic Latin after verbs of wishing and prohibition) and also its assimilation to the Greek aorist infinitive (the perfect tense was in fact already used in prose to reproduce the Greek aorist; cf. Hofmann-Szantyr 318 [§ 178 b]); cf. Serv. *Aen.* 6.79, *excussisse vero deum pro excutere, tempus est pro tempore. est autem Attica figura, qua nos uti non convenit, quia hac licenter utuntur poetae*; Kenney 171 *ad* Lucr. 3.683 *cresse*; Norden 147 and Austin 67 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 6.79, (*possit*) *excussisse*; Smith 191 and Murgatroyd 55 *ad* Tib. 1.1.29–30, *pudeat tenuisse . . . increpuisse*; Enk 183–184 *ad* Prop. 2.13.11, *me iuvet . . . legisse*; McKeown 92 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.4.38, *dedisse velis*; Bömer 500 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 3.188, *vellet . . . habuisse*; Barratt 161 *ad* Luc. *Civ.* 5.494 *venisse volet*; Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, pp. 109–112; C. E. Bennett, *Syntax of early Latin* I *The verb* (1910) 427–428; Kühner-Stegmann 1.133–134; Hofmann-Szantyr 351–352 (§ 193a); P. A. Perotti, "L'infinito perfetto in Tibullo e nel *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Orpheus* 10 (1989) 141–149. However, in the present case *implesse*—like *dedisse*, l. 2—has, perhaps intentionally, an ambiguous temporal value (*pace* Perotti, *art. cit.*, p. 142). It could equally well be taken as a real past—interpreting Lygdamus to be complaining about having prayed to the gods to no avail—or a gnomic aorist with ll. 1–2 as a *sententia*, since there is in fact no personal subject expressed until l. 3. Cf. also Lygd. 6.63–64, *iam dudum . . . / debueram sertis* ***implicuisse*** *comas* (comm.).

2 blandaque cum multa: the adjective *blandus* presents problems of interpretation here: is it describing as "pleasant", "heady", the incense regarded as an aromatic substance, or else as "persuasive, flattering, softening the gods, propitiatory", given the ultimate purpose of incense? Prop. 4.6.4 (quoted in the following n.) where the 'iunctura' *blanda tura* is parallel to *costum molle*, argues in favour of the first interpretation, but the presence of *prece* in the same line suggests the second, in view of the frequency of the 'iunctura' *blanda prece* (cf. Lygd. 6.46; Hor. *Od.* 4.1.8; *Poet.* 395, *prece blanda/*; Ov. *Her.* 3.30; *Ars* 1.170; *Met.* 10.642; [Albinov.] *Liv.* 424; Sen. *Her. f.* 1014; never in prose, according to *ThLL* 2.2039.10–11; cf. also Stat. *Ach.* 1.911, *blandus . . . precum . . . Ulixes*; *Theb.* 11.103, *blandam precatu Antigonem timeo*). In fact, some editors (Bergk, Müller) have even gone so far as to switch the two adjectives (*multaque cum blanda tura dedisse prece*). However, not only the passage from Propertius supports the plausibility

of the combination *blanda . . . tura*; in addition, the ancients used to apply the term *blandae*, "propitiatory", to the victims (*hostiae*) offered to the gods in an attempt to placate their wrath; cf. Ov. *Fasti* 5. 299–300, *saepe deos aliquis peccando fecit iniquos, / et pro delictis hostia blanda fuit*; Hor. *Od.* 3.23.17–20, *inmunis aram si tetigit manus, / non sumptuosa blandior hostia / mollivit aversos Penatis / farre pio et saliente mica.* The term *blandus* is also applied to one who regularly entreats the gods; cf. Ov. *Her.* 5.57–60, *utque celer venias, virides Nereidas oro, / . . . / Votis ergo meis alii rediture redisti. / Ei mihi! pro dira paelice blanda fui*; Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.134–35, *poscit opem chorus et praesentia numina sentit, / caelestis implorat aquas docta prece blandus.* In any case, there would have been no need to fall back on inversion, as the device used by Lygdamus is attested in Greek and Latin poetry. Wilamowitz (*Euripides, Herakles* II² 199) shows that it is a much more refined device than the common enallage of the adjective: "durch die Vertauschung der Attribute wird die vollkommene Einheitlichkeit eines Bildes erzielt" (*idem*, p. 198). The mainly Euripidean examples quoted by Wilamowitz (*Philologus* 563; *HF* 883; *Supp.* 902; *Med.* 1123), are supplemented by Leo (*Ausgew. kl. Schr.* II 175–178), who adds some instances from Latin poetry; of these, Fedeli *ad* Prop. 1.18.21 (p. 433) and 1.22.7–8 (pp. 503–504), apart from the Propertian passages *ad hoc* and the present passage of Lygdamus, highlights Lucr. 6.1127, *aut alios hominum pastus pecudumque cibatus* (= *pecudum pastus hominumque cibatus*); Verg. *Ecl.* 3.108–109, *et vitula tu dignus et hic et quisquis amores / aut metuet dulces aut experietur amaros* (= *aut experietur dulces aut metuet amaros*); *Aen.* 8.81–82, *candida per silvam cum fetu concolor albo / procubuit viridique in litore conspicitur sus* (= *conspicitur viridique in litore procubuit sus*); Prop. 2.1.28, *aut canerem Siculae classica bella fugae* (= *Sicula bella cum classis fugit*). For the double enallage of adjectives, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.268, *ibant obscuri sola sub nocte* (with Norden 112); Ov. *Am.* 3.7.21 (cf. V. Cristóbal 100); Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.49; 81; 95; 4.84 (cf. Laguna 30–31); K. Thomamüller, "Doppelte Enallage", *RhM* 111 (1968) 189–190; Hofmann-Szantyr 160 (§ 93). In my opinion, however, there is no need to understand a double enallage here.

blanda . . . tura: cf. Prop. 4.6.5, *costum molle date et blandi mihi turis honores.*

multa . . . prece: cf. Hor. *Ep.* 1.13.18, *oratus multa prece.*

tura dedisse: for the phrase, cf. Tib. 1.8.70, *nec prodest sanctis tura dedisse focis* (metrically in the same place in the pentameter); cf. also Ov. *Met.* 7.588–589, *quis non altaribus illis / inrita tura dedit?*

tura: incense, Gr. λίβανος, is a gum resin obtained from the tree

of the same name by making cuts in the trunk and saving the milky sap which pours out and hardens in the form of tears when it comes into contact with the air. It gives off an aromatic scent when burnt, and for this reason was used by the Romans as a perfume in religious ceremonies. It was brought to Rome from Arabia and Africa, and as a result of its high cost, adulteration of the substance proved a lucrative business; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 12.51 ff.; Miller, *Spice Trade*, pp. 102 ff.

3–10: clauses introduced by a completive-final *ut*, stemming from the idea of entreaty contained in *votis* (l. 1) and *prece* (l. 2). For the verbs *oro*, *rogo*, *imploro*, *obsecro*, *posco*, *precor*, *flagito* and similar, the construction with *ut* is the normal one in all periods of Latin; cf. Kühner-Stegmann II.2.212; Hofmann-Szantyr 644 (§ 349); Ernout-Thomas 255; Bassols II.184, 221. By means of an elaborate priamel (*non ut—aut ut—sed ut*) Lygdamus highlights the unusual content of his plea, in contrast with the pleas of ordinary mortals to the gods: he is not asking for wealth and honours, only to be allowed to share a long life in the company of Neaera until death causes them to part. For the choice of happiness in love rather than the possession of wealth, cf. Thgn. 1063 ff.; Theoc. 8.53 ff.; Pl. *Curc.* 178 ff.; Tib. 1.1.51–52; 2.75–76; 8.33–34; 9.71–72; Prop. 1.14.15–22; Hor. *Ep.* 1.6.65–66; Alciphr. 2.3.12–13; see also the commentary on ll. 23–24; on the rhetorico-poetical device of the priamel, see Lygd. 2.1–8 (comm.).

3–4: Lygdamus is not asking the gods for the social prestige that comes from being the *dominus* of a luxurious mansion, a man admired by all when he proudly steps out in public. There is a similar image in Sil. 6.442, *tua, respice, sedes / haec est, unde ingens humeris fulgentibus ostro / vidisti Latios consul procedere fasces.* Cf. also ll. 13–16 (comm.).

3 marmorei . . . e limine tecti: for the formulation, cf. Hor. *Ep.* 1.18.73, *intra marmoreum venerandi limen amici*; [Verg.] *Cir.* 222, *marmoreo . . . in limine* (with Lyne 191–192).

marmorei . . . tecti: for the phrase, cf. Cic. *Par.* 13, *marmoreis tectis ebore et auro fulgentibus.*

prodirem e limine: for the exact meaning of *prodirem*, cf. Varro *Lat.* 7.81, *qui exit in vestibulum, quod est ante domum, prodire et procedere dicitur*; cf. also *OLD prodeo* b.

limine tecti: the same line-ending (or the variant *limina tecti*) in Ov. *Met.* 5.43–44, *limine tecti / exierat Cepheus*; 14.254 (with Bömer 93); *Fasti* 1.137; *Ibis* 613; Juvenc. 2.451 *CSEL* 24 p. 62; Sedul. *Carm. pasch.* 1.44 *CSEL* 10 p. 18; Coripp. *Iust.* 3.1 p. 137; Paul. Petric. *Mart.* 2.575 p. 56; Sedul.-Scot. *Carm. app.* 2.23 p. 239; other *loci* in

Schumann, *LHL* III, p. 202; for the expression, cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 2.507–508, (*Priamus*) *convulsaque vidit / limina tectorum*; Stat. *Theb.* 2.479, *tecti e limine sumno aspectant matres.* The formula eventually even became a poetic periphrasis to denote the door itself (cf. Sil. 6.73, *limina pulsabat tecti*); cf. *ThLL* 7.2.1404.22–25.

tecti: *tectum* is *domus* by synecdoche (*pars pro toto*), a common poetic usage from the archaic period; cf. Enn. *Ann.* 620, *vosque lares tectum nostrum qui funditus curant*; in prose from Cicero on (cf. *Tull.* 34; *Verr.* 4.25; *Pomp.* 32; *Cat.* 3.12.29, *vos, Quirites, . . . in vestra tecta discedite*; *Pis.* 52); cf. *OLD tectum* 2a; Forcellini VI, p. 35 s.v. *tectum* 5. The use of the plural in this topos in much more frequent than the singular; cf. also Cic. *De or.* 3.42.168, *intellegi volumus aliquid aut ex parte totum, ut pro aedificiis cum "parietes" aut "tecta" dicimus, aut ex toto partem, ut cum . . .*; Quint. *Inst.* 8.6.19–20, *synecdoche . . . liberior poetis quam oratoribus; nam prosa ut "mucronem" pro gladio et "tectum" pro domo recipiet, ita non "puppim" pro navi*; Barratt 5–6 *ad* Luc. *Civ.* 5.11 *in externis . . . tectis*; R. Lunderstedt, *De synecdochae apud P. Papinium Statium usu*, p. 13; Laguna 30; Lausberg, *Retórica Literaria*, pp. 76–77 (§ 573.1).

4: with the Augustan poets the priamel becomes fossilized, and frequently, as here, the pentameter adds nothing significant to the corresponding hexameter. However, *clara . . . domo* could refer to illustrious lineage; for *domus* in the sense of "family, household", cf. *ThLL* 5.1.1981.15 ff.; *OLD domus* 6a.

conspicuus: ie 'dignum quod conspiciatur, insigne, illustre', "attracting attention" (Gr. ἔκδηλος). The adjective is clearly Ovidian in tone. With the exception of a fragment of the orator Helvius Mancia (beg. 1st c. BC), *Orat.* 1, *pari claritate conspicuum M. Brutum* (= Val.-Max. 6.2.8), *conspicuus*—in both of its senses, *visibilis* and *insigne* (*ThLL* 4.498.56–499.52)—is only attested from the Augustan period onwards. However, among the Augustan poets it only appears once in Horace (cf. *Od.* 3.16.19, *late conspicuum tollere verticem*) and thirteen times in Ovid (cf. *Am.* 2.11.4, *conspicuam fulvo vellere . . . ovem*; *Her.* 5.139; 15.132; *Ars* 3.394; *Medic.* 20; *Met.* 8.373; 12.467; *Fasti* 1.82; *Tr.* 2.54; 4.10.108; *Ponto* 3.1.56; 4.22; 4.7.31, *conspicuus longe fulgentibus armis*); in classical prose, cf. Liv. 1.34.11, *Romanis conspicuum eum novitas divitiaeque faciebant*; nor is it very frequent in the post-classical period (cf. eg Phaedr. 4.66; Sen. *Thy.* 126; Luc. *Civ.* 4.170; Curt. 4.4.11, *conspicuus longe fulgentibus armis*). In general the verbal adjective *conspiciendus* is preferred (cf. eg Tib. 1.2.70; 2.3.52; Ov. *Fasti* 5.118; *Tr.* 2.114; Mart. 9.49.4; *ThLL* 5.1.497.34–43) or the adjectival participle *conspectuus*; cf.

eg Verg. *Ge.* 3.17; Ov. *Met.* 12.553; 13.174; [Albinov.] *Liv.* 122; *ThLL* 5.1.497.19–26.

The fact that *conspicuus* is used of the person or thing that as a result of some physical characteristic or personal virtue attracts people's attention and admiration, makes it tempting to regard *domo* as house or mansion (and not as "family", "lineage") and to relate *clara* ("shining") with *marmorei* (l. 3). However, the pentameter would then become redundant, quite apart from the fact that the other attested cases of the phrase (see following n.) make it quite clear that the reference here is to "illustrious lineage".

clara . . . domo: for the expression *clara domus* in the full physical sense ("resplendent mansion"), cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.12.8, *fulgens . . . domus*; 3.3.33–34, *lucidas . . . sedes* (referring in both of these passages to Mount Olympus). However, the dynastic sense of *domus* in the phrase *clara domus* is very strong; cf. [Sall.] *Rep.* 2.13.2; Ov. *Her.* 17.53–56, *et genus et proavos et regia nomina iactas. / Clara satis domus haec nobilitate sua est; / Iuppiter ut soceri proavus taceatur et omne / Tantalidae Pelopis Tyndareique genus*; Liv. 3.32.2; Sen. *Phoen.* 53, *Labdaci claram domum*; Sil. 15.258; Paneg. 12(2).3.6; *ThLL* 5.1.1983.3–5.

5–6: from the dream of the *homo urbanus* (ll. 3–4) we move on to that of the *homo rusticus*: to be the owner of vast stretches of fertile land that will yield generous harvests.

5: note the elaborate formulation of this hexameter (*multa mei renovarent iugera tauri*), structured as a *versus aureus* or 'golden line': verb in the centre, preceded by two adjectives and followed by their respective nouns, in chiastic formation or otherwise (abVBA or abVAB). This type of symmetrical arrangement, unknown in Ennius and very rare in Lucretius (two examples), was strongly favoured by Catullus and the *neoterici*, poets who were, of course, influenced by the refined technique of the Alexandrians and were lovers of harmonious formal arrangements. Virgil, particularly in the *Aeneid*, is more restrained in his use of it than his successors, especially Ovid, Lucan, Calpurnius Siculus and Claudian, who resort to it profusely. It should be recalled that the little that is known of Gallus is a *versus aureus*: *uno tellures dividit amne duas* (*Frg.* 1 *FPR* p. 360 Baehrens *FPL* p. 99 Morel); cf. F. Graf, "Die Gallus-Verse von Qar Ibrîm", *Gymnasium* 89 (1982) 31.

J. M. Baños Baños, in a recent article ("El *versus aureus* de Ennio a Estacio", *Latomus* 51 [1992] 762–774) shows the clear tendency of the Latin poets to use the *versus aureus*: of the 60 possible

combinations of two adjectives, their corresponding nouns and a verb within a Latin hexameter, the frequency of the two possible combinations of the 'golden line' is 25.5% of the total number of hexameters with these formal characteristics (two adjective-substantive noun phrases and one verb). The choice of the *versus aureus* was favoured by the Latin poets' clear tendency: 1) to place the verb in the centre of the hexameter; 2) to avoid the presence of two nouns together at the beginning of the line; and 3) to separate the noun from its adjective; in which case the adjective tends to precede the noun and occupy, in general, the end of the first hemistich (that is, before the penthemimeral caesura), while the noun tends to occupy end-line position. The explanation for the substantial differences between the various authors in the use of the *versus aureus* is to be found in the actual historical evolution of the Latin hexameter and its gradual consolidation and normalization, as well as in the formal conditioning for the different literary genres and the aesthetic tastes of the individual poet.

On the *versus aureus*, see in addition L. P. Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry* (1963) 215 ff.; D. O. Ross, *Style and tradition in Catullus* (1969) 132 ff.; S. E. Winbolt, *Latin Hexameter Verse*, (1903) 219 ff.; Fordyce 275–276 *ad* Catul. 64 (*proemium*); Thomas 86 *ad* Verg. *Ge.* 1.117; Williams 49–50 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 5.46; *Trad. & Orig.*, pp. 650, 657, 706, 721; McKeown 67 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.3.9, *nec meus innumeris renovatur campus aratris* (a line of similar composition, meaning and context to that of Lygdamus); Bömer 415 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 15.612, *demisere oculos omnes gemitumque dedere*; Barratt 26–27 *ad* Luc. *Civ.* 5.70, *Delphica fatidici reserat penetralia Phoebi*; Laguna 347–348 *ad* Stat. *Silv.* 3.5.2, *anxia pervigili ducis suspiria cura* (cf. also pp. 24–25); Norden, *Aeneid VI*, Anh. III, pp. 395–396; Marouzeau, *Ordres des Mots* III, pp. 182–183; *Stylistique*, pp. 320–321.

multa . . . iugera: for the phrase, cf. Tib. 1.1.2, *iugera multa* (multa *Par.Fr.Diomedes*: magna *A*; cf. K. P. Harrington, *CR* 9 [1895] 108–109), in the same context of the repudiation of wealth; 2.3.42, *multa innumera iugera* (as a symbol of avarice and wealth); Ov. *Ponto* 4.9.86, *iugera multa reti*; for the opposite expression *pauca iugera*, cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.15.1; Verg. *Ge.* 4.127; Ov. *Am.* 3.15.12; *Fasti* 3.192; Juv. 9.60. The *iugerum* is an agrarian measure represented by a rectangle of 28,800 square feet—the square foot measuring 0.088 m^2-, that is, 240 feet long by 120 wide, just over a quarter of a hectare; cf. Varro *Lat.* 5.34, *iugerum dictum iunctis duobus actibus quadratis*; *Rust.* 1.10.2, *iugerum (dicunt), quod quadratos duos actus habeat*; Paul. *Fest.* p. 17; Col. *Rust.*

5.1.5, *actus quadratus undique finitur pedibus CXX; hoc duplicatum facit iugerum, et ab eo quod erat iunctum, nomen iugeri usurpavit*; 8, *iugerum habet quadratorum pedum viginti octo milia et octingentos*; 12; Plin. *Nat.* 18.9; Quint. *Inst.* 1.10.42; Isid. *Orig.* 15.15.5; *ThLL* 7.2.627.60–67. A *iugerum* of land was roughly what a pair of oxen could plough in one day.

renovarent: with the exception of a passage in the *Nux* (l. 64, *duratam renovat non mihi fossor humum*), the use of *renovare* to indicate the renewal or regeneration of the land either by leaving it fallow or by ploughing or hoeing, is limited to Ovid; cf. *Am.* 1.3.9, *nec meus innumeris renovatur campus aratris* (with McKeown 66–67); *Met.* 1.110, *renovatus ager* (with Bömer 55); 15.125, *illa, quibus totiens durum renovaverat arvum, / . . . percussit colla securi*; *Fasti* 1.159, *tum patitur cultus ager et renovatur aratro*; *Tr.* 4.6.13, *hoc* (scil. *tempus*) *tenuat dentem terram renovantis aratri*; 5.12.23–24, *fertilis, assiduo si non renovetur aratro, nil nisi cum spinis gramen habebit ager*; Forcellini 5.171–172 s.v.; *OLD renovo* 1d. Ovid only once applies this verb to oxen, as here, (cf. *Met.* 15.125), since on most occasions he uses it of ploughing. Outside Ovid, the verb *renovare* with reference to land only reappears in Mart. 2.75.6, *turba, sanguineam rastris quae renovabat humum*, in this case the circus arena. The verbs usually employed by the Latin poets to refer to the action of ploughing or breaking up the earth are: *dimovere* (eg Verg. *Ge.* 2.513, *agricola incurvo terram dimovit aratro*), *findere* (eg Hor. *Od.* 1.1.11, *findere sarculo agros*; Lygd. 3.12 [comm.]), *iterare* (eg Varro *Rust.* 1.32.1; Cic. *De or.* 2.131; Nisbet-Hubbard I 107–108; *OLD* s.v. 6a), *(pro)scindere* (eg Acc. *Trag.* 496; Verg. *Ge.* 1.97; 2.399; 3.160; Ov. *Her.* 17.141), *sulcare* (eg Tib. 2.3.79), and especially *versare* (eg Hor. *Od.* 3.6.39, *ligonibus versare glebas*; Tib. 2.3.6, *versarem valido pingue bidente solum*; Prop. 4.1.129, *tua cum multi versarent rura iuvenci*; Ov. *Ars* 1.725–726, *agricolae, qui vomere semper adunco / et gravibus rastris sub Iove versat humum*; Val.-Max. 1.1.12; Juv. 7.49); rarely found in poetry is the prosaic *arare* (cf. eg Verg. *Ge.* 1.299, *nudus ara, sere nudus*, or the technical periphrasis *boves aratuti* or *arantes*, "labouring oxen", in Tib. 1.10.46; Prop. 2.19.11; Ov. *Ars* 3.120).

It should be added that the poetic use of the verb *renovare*, whatever its meaning, is most uncommon, with the exception of Ovid and Statius: twice in Lucr. (2.591; 6.1076); Verg. twice (*Aen.* 2.3 and 750); never in Hor.; Tib. once (2.6.41); [Tib.] once (*Paneg.* 113); Prop. once (3.12.35); Ov. 16 times (*Am.* 1.3.9; *Ars* 3.583; *Rem.* 733; *Fasti* 1.159; *Met.* 1.110; 5.156; 7.177; 215; 9.425; 11.472; 14.465; 15.125; *Tr.* 2.209; 4.6.13; 5.12.23; *Ponto* 3.7.34); Luc. 3 times (*Civ.* 4.204; 600; 9.183); Stat. 10 (*Theb.* 3.141; 5.110; 465; 10.926; *Ach.* 1.595;

Silv. 3.1.1; 174; 4.101; 4.1.38; 4.60), in addition to *Nux* 64.

6 terra benigna: the same expression in the same place in the pentameter in Tib. 1.3.62, *floret odoratis terra benigna rosis*. For *benignus* applied to the country in the sense of "fertile", cf. also Ov. *Am.* 1.10.56, *praebeat Alcinoi poma benignus ager* (with McKeown 303–304); Plin. *Nat.* 18.1, *benigna tellure proveniunt*; 33.2, *tanquam parum benigna fertilique*; Stat. *Theb.* 12.620, *Parnes . . . benignus vitibus*; for *benignus* in the sense of 'large praebens, copiosus, abundans, fertilis', cf. *ThLL* 2.1904.22–46; for the bountifulness of the land, cf. also Col. *Rust.* 4.24.12, *benignitas terrae* (as a result of the sun). For *benignus* applied to rivers, see McKeown 416 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.15.34, *auriferi ripa benigna Tagi*. There is a similar use of *dives*; eg Ov. *Met.* 1.137–138, *dives/ . . . humus* (in the context of the Golden Age).

7–10: 2nd part of the priamel. Note how the adversative conjunction *sed* acts as a pivot, conferring a radical shift in meaning, and how the whole emphasis falls on the proleptic *tecum*. Strictly speaking, the two preceding distichs making up the 1st part of the priamel (ll. 3–6: *alii*) are contrasted by a single distich (ll. 7–8), although, to round off the structure of the priamel, Lygdamus extends the funereal tone of l. 8 with another distich (ll. 9–10). At first sight, this amplification might seem to be mere filling, the typical chronological reference to the moment of death in a long and solemn periphrasis, not without its affected and empty rhetoric; however, closer analysis reveals popular-philosophical implications in the pentameter concerning death, which act as counter-balance to the first part of the priamel (see note on l. 10 *nudus*). As for the content, behind these lines lies the purely elegiac conception of happiness, consisting of a long amorous relationship with a lover who will remain faithful right up to death, when even the dutiful presence of the faithful beloved brings comfort and companionship in the solitude of that critical juncture. The closest elegiac passage is undoubtedly Ov. *Am.* 1.3.17–18, *tecum, quos dederint annos mihi fila Sororum, vivere contingant teque dolente mori*, in which life, death and the beloved are similarly intertwined. For the notion of living and dying in the company of the beloved, cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.9.24, *tecum vivere amem, tecum obeam libens*. For the funeral fantasy of ll. 8–10, that is, the erotic motif of gazing at the beloved at the moment of death, in addition to the above-cited Hor. *Od.* 3.9.24 and Ov. *Am.* 1.3.17–18 (with McKeown 71), cf. also Tib. 1.1.59–60, *te spectem, suprema mihi cum venerit hora, / te teneam moriens deficiente manu*; Prop. 1.17 and 19; 2.24B; 4.7.23–24; Ov. *Tr.* 3.3.43–44; Nisbet-

Hubbard 96 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 2.6; Laguna 364 *ad* Stat. *Silv.* 3.5.37–38. What is really novel in Lygdamus is the idea of growing old together with the beloved, an idea which is not so clearly expressed in the other elegists and which ties in with an ideal of marriage; cf. Tib. 2.2.19–20 (on the happy marriage of Cornutus), *vincula* (scil. *Amoris*), *quae maneant semper, dum tarda senectus / inducat rugas inficiatque comas*; Ov. *Tr.* 4.8.11–12, *inque sinu dominae . . . / securus . . . consenuisse*; 10.73, *ultima [uxor] . . . seros permansit in annos* (Ovid is referring to his wife in both passages); Stat. *Silv.* 3.5.23–24, *(tu) quam mihi sorte Venus iunctam florentibus annis / servat et in senium*; 106–107 (with Laguna 390).

7 sociarem gaudia: in the *sermo amatorius* the equivalence *gaudia* = *concubitus* is frequent; cf. Montero Cartelle, *Latín erótico*, 184–185; Adams, *Latin sexual vocabulary*, 197–198; *ThLL* 6.2.1712.33 ff. (for other erotic meanings of *gaudia*, as an abstract-for-concrete metonymic expression = "the beloved", cf. La Penna, "Note sul linguaggio erotico dell'elegia latina", *Maia* 4 [1951] 199; *ThLL* 6.2.1712.73 ff.). This erotic sense of *gaudia* as *gaudia Veneris* is attested from Lucretius onwards (cf. 4.1106; 1196; 1205; cf. also Catul. 61.117; Hor. *Od.* 3.6.28), but it is undoubtedly in the elegiac poets that it is most frequent (cf. eg Tib. 1.5.39; 2.1.12; 3.72; Prop. 3.8.30 [with Fedeli 296]; Ov. *Am.* 2.3.2; 3.7.63 [with Brandt]; *Ars* 2.459; 3.805; *Rem.* 401 [with Pinotti]; 727–728; *Met.* 7.736; 796; 12.198); cf. also *gaudia Veneris* in Petr. *Satyr.* 132.15; Mart. 11.27.5 (with Kay 129). The same erotic sense is also attested for *sociare* ("to have sexual intercourse"), particularly when it is constructed with certain nouns such as *corpus* or *cubile* (cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.8.5; *Her.* 3.109; *Met.* 10.635, *unus eras, cum quo sociare cubilia possem*). It would therefore not be too fanciful to understand *sociare gaudia* as an elegant and euphemistic way of alluding to the *communia* (or *mutua*) *gaudia Veneris*; cf. Tib. 1.1.69, *iungamus amores*.

gaudia vitae: this line-ending was very popular in late Latin and Christian literature; cf. [Cato] *Dist.* 2.3.2 p. 99; Aus. *Carm.* 6.31.5 p. 83; Orient. *Comm.* 2.353; Commod. *Instr.* 1.35.16 p. 29; Prud. *Symm.* 2.908 p. 242; *CLE* 446.2 p. 209; 720 p. 342 (= *ICL* 1 p. 319 nr. 1645.3); 1296.1 p. 606; 1849 p. 850 (= *ICL* 1 p. 64 nr. 267.9); for more *loci*, see Schumann, *LHL*, V, pp. 405–407.

8: for a similar formulation of the moment of passing away in the arms of a loved one, cf. Prop. 4.11.64, *condita sunt vestro lumina nostra sinu*. The image is heavily laden with Tibullan-like pathos.

inque . . . sinu: the use of the preposition *in* followed by the enclytic *-que* is typical of Ovid, as pointed out by G. Baligan ("Il libro terzo

del *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Studi pubblicati dall'Ist. di Filol. Class. della Univ. di Bologna* I [1948] 27); cf. Ov. *Her.* 13.78, *inque pios dominae posse redire sinus*; 20.46, *inque tui cupido rapta ferere sinu*; *Ars* 2.458, *inque tuos flens est accipienda sinus*; *Met.* 10.558, *inque sinus iuvenis posita cervice reclinis*; in particular, *Tr.* 4.8.11–12, *inque sinu dominae carisque sodalibus inque / securus patria consenuisse mea* (the idea of growing old also being present here).

caderet: "collapse"; in connection with old age, cf. Cic. *Off.* 2.13, *tecta si aut vi tempestati aut terrae motu aut vetustate cecidissent.* In the sense of "to die, to fall dead", this verb is only attested (and abundantly so) in the context of war, with the meaning "to die in battle, to fall in combat" (*OLD cado* 9a; *ThLL* 3.23.9 ff.). Its transferal to the *sermo amatorius* is previously attested (the only case) in Prop. 2.28.42, *vivam, si vivet; si cadet illa, cadam*, with the verb *cadere* used in the absolute sense of "to die". Behind this use of Lygdamus may be detected the elegiac motif of *militia amoris*: Lygdamus does not desire an honourable death on the battle-field, but rather to surrender in the arms of his mistress (on *militia amoris*, see Murgatroyd, *Latomus* 34 [1975] 59 ff.; *id.* 293–294 *ad* Tib. 1.10.53–56). For another opinion, see Dissen (333 *ad loc.*): "*caderet* est pr. *occideret*, ut alias saepe simplicia pr. compositis ponunt, cf. ad 1.2.80. Tamen hoc loco vox simul accommodata est bene infirmitati labenti senectutis".

nostra senecta: for this metonymic expression (abstract for concrete), equivalent in effect to *ego senex*, cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.6.5–6, *Tibur . . . / sit meae sedes utinam senectae* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 98, who cite Mart. 4.25.7); Verg. *Aen.* 11.165, *sors ista senectae / debita erat nostrae*; [Verg.] *Cir.* 287, *nostrae . . . inimice senectae*; 314, *o sola meae vivendi causa senectae* (with Lyne 233); Prop. 3.19.15, *patria succensa senecta*; Sen. *Herc. f.* 1249; Stat. *Theb.* 4.536. For the metonymic expression, cf. Lygd 2.13 (comm.).

senecta: the term *senecta* for "old age" is mainly found in poetry, and also in post-Augustan prose; in classical prose, on the other hand, the usual term is *senectus*. However, poets such as Virgil and Lucan tend to use *senectus* for the nominative—in the oblique cases *senecta*—for metrical reasons; in Ovid, though, the nominative of both forms is found in the pentameter. The same occurs with *iuventus* and *iuventa* (cf. Barratt 19 *ad* Luc. *Civ.* 5.51). In Tibullus the alternatives *senecta/senectus* show a fixed metrical distribution: when the term appears in a hexameter, it is always at the end of a line and with the metrical pattern ˘— (*senectae, senecta, senectus*); in the pentameter it is always in the nominative singular (twice), as penultimate word and with the metrical scheme ˘—˘, with an iambic disyllable always closing the line

(˘¯); cf. É. Évrard, "Vieux et ancien chez Tibulle", *Latomus* 37 (1978) 124. In Lygdamus only *senecta* is attested and its use is consistent with the Tibullan treatment: once in the ablative singular at the end of a hexameter (Lygd. 5.25), and twice in the nominative singular as the penultimate word of the pentameter before an iambic disyllable (Lygd. 3.8; 5.16).

9: Lygdamus here combines two verbs, *defungi* and *permetiri*, both used in a temporal sense, thus constructing an extended pleonasm (see the commentary on Lygd. 2.15–16). The meaning of these verbs here is an argument against an Augustan dating for the elegies of Lygdamus.

tunc cum: emended to *tum cum* by some modern editors (eg Heyne, Lenz, Smith, Ponchont, Luck): before a guttural the Latin poets tend to avoid *tunc* for reasons of euphony. However, the unanimity of the mss., which only transmit *tunc*, and the tendency of *tunc* to edge out the less emphatic *tum* (cf. Hofmann-Szantyr 519–520) argue in favour of the traditional reading; cf. Kenney 175 *ad* Lucr. 3.710.

permenso defunctus tempore lucis: for a similar pleonastic expression to describe euphemistically the moment of death as the end of a journey, cf. Lucr. 3.1042, *ipse Epicurus obit decurso lumine vitae* (with Bailey 1169); cf. Pl. *St.* 81, *decurso aetatis spatio*; Ter. *Ad.* 859, *ego vitam duram . . . prope iam excurso spatio mitto*; Prop. 2.15.41, *decurrre vitam.*

permenso: the use of *permetiri* in a temporal sense before Apuleius (cf. *Met.* 10.18, *gradatim permensis honoribus*) is only attested in Sen. *Oed.* 740, (*proles*) *uno aetatem permensa die* (referring to those born from the teeth of the dragon); *Herc. f.* 742, *longa permensus diu / felicis aevi spatia*, and Mart. 9.29.1, *saecula Nestoreae permensa, Philaeni, senectae*; 11.6, *cum spatium saeculi tui permensus ad inferos demearis.* The passive use of the perfect participle before Apuleius is only attested in Col. *Rust.* 3.13.13. For the period after Apuleius, cf. Nemes. *Ecl.* 1.20, *quem nunc emeritae permensum tempora vitae.*

defunctus: the use of *defungi* in connection with life on earth, in the sense of bringing it to a close, was introduced into Roman poetry by Virgil; cf. Verg. *Ge.* 4.475 (= *Aen.* 6.306), *defunctaque corpora vita* (= "lifeless body, corpse"), a formula later taken up in the same form by Ov. *Her.* 14.125–126 (cf. also Sen. *Ep.* 99.10, *qui cito vita defungitur*). *Defunctus* first appears as an adjective used in the absolute sense of *mortuus* in Ov. *Am.* 1.8.107–108, *saepe mihi dices vivae bene, saepe rogabis / ut mea defunctae molliter ossa cubent.* In the post-Augustan period this pregnant use of *defungi* became frequent, though always—with the exception of Sen. *Ep.* 99.10 *sup. cit.*—in the perfect, generally

in the participial form, as in Lygdamus; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 9.170, *defuncto illo venire pisces*; Quint. *Inst.* 5.5.2, *si . . . is . . . dicitur. . . . prius esse defunctus*; Tac. *Ann.* 15.23, *quartum intra mensem defuncta infante*; Suet. *Cal.* 5; Mart. 4.73.5; Apul. *Met.* 10.2, *matre multo ante defuncta*; *CIL* 6.25890, *qui defunctus est annorum III*; *OLD defungor* 2a and 3; *ThLL* 5.1.377.32 ff.; 378.54 ff. When the type of death requires to be specified, *defunctus* is accompanied by the ablative of cause *morte* together with a qualifying adjective; cf. Curt. 3.11.9, *egregia morte defuncti*; 5.8.1, *honesta morte*; Suet. *Iul.* 89, *sua morte defunctus est*, that is, "a natural death"; cf. *OLD defungor* 3; *ThLL* 5.1.378.37–41.

defunctus tempore: the combination of *defungi* and *tempus* is only found elsewhere in Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.21–22, *suisque / temporibus defuncta.*

tempore lucis: a variant on the clichéd expression *tempora vitae*, frequent at the end of a line (cf. [Verg.] *Catal.* 13.15; Hor. *Sat.* 1.1.118; [Tib.] 3.7.112a; Ov. *Met.* 3.469; *Ponto* 3.2.29; Luc. *Civ.* 4.481; 9.233; Manil. 3.560; Sen. *Apoc.* 4.2; 4.21; Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.205; Nemes. *Ecl.* 1.19 p. 177; 1.45 p. 178; Aus. *Carm.* 4 praef. 17 p. 29; 4.18.11 p. 41; *CLE* 1943.5; 1967.7; 2102.1; further *loci* in Schumann, *LHL* V, pp. 405–408), but undoubtedly avoided because of the proximity of *gaudia vitae/* (l. 7). The phrase is first attested in Ov. *Fasti* 3.404, *et quintae tempora lucis aget*, and then a few more times in post-classical and late Latin; cf. Homer. Lat. 736; Sedul. *Carm.* 1.188 p. 29; Arat. *Act.* 1.988 p. 29; Fort. *Carm.* 4.24.11 p. 94; Schumann, *LHL* V, p. 389.

lucis: for *lux* in the sense of *vita*, cf. Lucr. 3.1054, *decurso lumine vitae*; Verg. *Ge.* 4.255, *corpora luce carentum* (= 472); *Aen.* 3.311 ('de mortuis'), *lux alma recessit*; 12.873–874, *qua tibi lucem / arte morer?*; Ov. *Met.* 14.132, *lux aeterna mihi . . . dabatur*; *Tr.* 4.10.116, *nec me sollicitae taedia lucis habent*; Luc. *Civ.* 2.525, *omnis lucis rumpe moras*; Sil. 2.524; 11.48; Quint. *Inst.* 3.8.46; *OLD lux* 6a; *ThLL* 7.2.1910.6 ff.

10: for the content of this line, cf. particularly Prop. 3.5.14, *nudus at inferna[s], stulte, vehere rate[s]/* (with Fedeli 184), where the allusion to death appears in the same context of the development of the popular-philosophical motif of "contempt for wealth" (ll. 3–6) and the topos of the equality of all men, rich and poor, in the face of death (ll. 13–18). The same image is found in Sil. 5.267–269, *modo quem Fortuna fovendo / congestis opibus donisque refersit opimis, /* ***nudum*** *Tartarea portabit navita cymba.* The line of Propertius immediately preceding that mentioned above (13, *haud ullas portabis opes Acherontis ad undas*) sheds light on the real sense of this *nudus* which in Lygdamus appears to be somewhat impenetrable: what use is there in begging

the gods for wealth if these riches cannot accompany us in death, when we travel dispossessed (*nudus*) of all our earthly belongings? Some enlightenment on this point comes from the following words of Ovid to his wife Fabia, pointing out to her the inferiority of wealth to the immortality she has achieved thanks to his poetry (*Tr.* 5.14.11–12): *non ego divitias dando tibi plura dedissem: / nil feret ad Manes divitis umbra suos.* The motif that wealth does not accompany the deceased on his journey to Hades, but has to be left behind when the end comes, is developed poetically in two philosophical odes in which Horace deals with the topic of death (cf. *Od.* 2.3.17–28; 14.21–28) and is most deeply rooted in diatribe, where men's resistence to abandoning their possessions was an object of mockery (cf. Luc. *Cat.* 20). For other references, cf. Sol. 24.7–8 W. (= Thgn. 725–726), τὰ γὰρ περιώσια πάντα /χρήματ' ἔχων οὐδεὶς ἔρχεται εἰς 'Αίδεω; Phoen. 1.22–23 Powell, ἐγὼ δ' ἐς ῞Αιδην οὔτε χρυσὸν οὔθ' ἵππον / οὔτ' ἀργυρῆν ἄμαξαν ᾠχόμην ἕλκων; Petr. *Satyr.* 43.8, *hoc solum enim secum tulit*; Mart. 8.44.9, *rape conger aufer posside: reliquendum est*; Luc. *DMort.* 20(10).1, γυμνοὺς ἐπιβαίνειν χρή; *AP* 9.145.5–6 (Anon.); 10.58.1 (Pallad.), γῆς ἐπέβην γυμνός, γυμνὸς θ' ὑπὸ γαῖαν ἄπειμι; Nisbet-Hubbard 233–234 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 2.14.21; Fedeli 184 *ad* Prop. 3.5.14.

nudus: for the use of this adjective in the figurative sense of "poor, possessing no wealth, deprived of all material possessions", cf. Cic. *Amer.* 23 and 147; *Rab. Post.* 39; *Flac.* 21, *quem tu semper nudum esse voluisti*; Ov. *Am.* 1.10.15, *nudus Amor* (with McKeown 288); Juv. 3.210; cf. also Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.184, *nudus agris, nudus nummis* . . . *paternis*; *OLD* *nudus* 10; cf. its proverbial use in Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 247 s.v. *nudus* [1248–1250]. Here, *nudus* may also denote the defencelessness of old age in the face of death; cf. Ov. *Her.* 9.154, *Oenea desertum nuda senecta* (= "helpless old age") *premit*; Juv. 7.35, *facunda et nuda senectus*.

Lethaea . . . rate: the same expression is found in Lygd. 5.24. The Lethaean boat is undoubtedly the vessel of Charon, the underworld spirit whose mission it was to ferry the shades across the swamp-like waters of the Acheron to the opposite bank of the river of the dead. Charon, the harsh and tyrannical boatman, simply steered the funeral craft, since the souls themselves were given the task of rowing. There is a masterly portrayal of this sinister boatman in Verg. *Aen.* 6.298–304 (ἔκφρασις Χάρωντος), with Norden 220–221 and the lengthy n. by Austin 125; cf. also Smith 382–383 *ad* Tib. 1.10.36 (*navita turpis*). None can escape the fatal vessel (*ratis fati*, as it is called in Prop. 2.28.39); cf. Nisbet-Hubbard 66 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 2.3.28. The

adjective *Lethaeus* had already been used by the Augustan poets to refer to the waters and rivers of the underworld without particular reference to the River Lethe (for *Lethaeus* 'strictiore sensu', cf. *ThLL* 7.2.1186.5–19), but in a sense absolutely equivalent to that of *infernus* (first in Catul. 65.5, *mei . . . Lethaeo gurgite fratris pallidulum manans alluit unda pedem*; cf. also [Verg.] *Cul.* 215, *Lethaeas . . . transire per undas*; Tib. 1.3.80, *Lethaeas . . . aquas*; Prop. 4.7.10; 91). In post-classical Latin this poetic use of *Lethaeus* in place of the more prosaic *infernus* increases noticeably (cf. Mart. 7.96.7, *ad Lethaeas . . . undas*; Sen. *Her. O.* 1985; Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.22; *Theb.* 12.559; Capel. 2.116, *Lethaea ad litora*; *ThLL* 7.2.1185.66–84), eventually even being applied *latiore sensu* not only to the rivers of the underworld but—as in Lygdamus—to anything related to this lower world (the first and only such appearance in the Augustan period being in Hor. *Od.* 4.7.27–28, *Lethaea . . . vincula*; in the post-Augustan period, cf. eg Sen. *Phaed.* 147, *Lethaeo . . . profundo*; Stat. *Silv.* 5.3.24, *Lethaei . . . campi*; 285; *Theb.* 4.414, *Lethaea . . . sacra*; *ThLL* 7.2.1185.76–81), in particular those of the *dei inferi* (Col. *Rust.* 10.271, *Lethaei . . . tyranni*; Luc. *Civ.* 6.685, *Lethaeos . . . deos*; Stat. *Silv.* 3.2.112, *Lethaeus ianitor* [= Anubis, identified with Cerberus; cf. Laguna 232]; *CIL* 6.30114, *cum mea Lethaeae ruperunt fila sorores*; *ThLL* 7.2.1185.81–84). The Lygdamean combination *Lethaea . . . rate* is therefore a more poetic variant of the Propertian *inferna . . . rate* (Prop. 3.5.14 [with Fedeli 184]); cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 6.385, *Stygia . . . carina*; Sil. 5.269, *tartarea . . . cymba*; *AL* 1109 Buecheler, *caeruleam . . . carinam.*

cogerer ire rate: Vulpius pointed out the repetition—a total of four times—in the second half of the pentameter of the *littera canina* (cf. Pers. 1.109), the letter R, so called because the sound is contained in the dog's growl (cf. also Lucil. 2 M., *(r littera) inritata canes* [arch. nom. sing.] *quam homo quam planius dicit*). By using this rough sound (rer, re, ra) Lygdamus might have intended to reflect the ill temper of the spirits forced against their will to cross over to the shores of the dead. A similar alliteration of the *littera canina* was used by Virgil in *Aen.* 6.417–419 to reproduce the barking of Cerberus, the dog of the underworld (onomatopoeia), as was observed by La Cerda in his *editio Matritensis* of 1612 (cf. Norden *Aeneis VI*, p. 243); and previously, in his virulent *flagitatio* against Ameana (*Carm.* 42), Catullus had accompanied his insult of "bitch-faced" (cf. also l. 9, *ridentem catuli ore Gallicani*) with a doglike accumulation of growling Rs (ll. 16–17, *ruborem / ferreo canis exprimamus ore* [with Fordyce 195]).

cogerer: ie by fate. By the use of this verb Lygdamus emphasizes

the popular-philosophical thought that death is binding on all, whether rich or poor (cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.3.21–25, *divesne prisco natus ab Inacho / nil interest an pauper et infima / de gente sub divo moreris, / victima nil miserantis Orci; omnes eodem* ***cogimur*** [with Nisbet-Hubbard 65]; [Verg.] *Cul.* 372–373, *Ditis opacos /* ***cogor*** *adire lacus*), as well as pointing to the violence with which the souls of the departed are led, against their will, to the underworld (cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.24.16–18, *(vana imago) quam virga semel horrida [. . .] nigro* ***compulerit*** *Mercurius gregi*, with Nisbet-Hubbard 287–288). Like *compello*, *cogo* suggests the Horatian image of the of the dead being herded (cf. *ThLL* 3.1520.82 ff.). The constraints imposed upon the spirits of the dead in hell also find poetic expression in such significant verbs as *compescere* (eg Hor. *Od.* 2.14.9), *coercere* (eg Hor. *Od.* 2.18.38; Verg. *Ge.* 4.478–480; *Aen.* 6.438–439) or *cohibere* (eg Hor. *Od.* 2.20.8).

11–24: Lygdamus here first develops at length the Cynico-Stoic motif of disdain for wealth (ll. 21–22), and ends (ll. 23–24) by introducing on a personal note the purely elegiac viewpoint: "not wealth, but love". On the superiority of *Amor* over *divitiae*, cf. Prop. 1.4. In fact, until the *discidium* of Neaera is made clear in ll. 25–26, we cannot see that underlying this section is Tib. 1.2.75–76, *quid Tyrio recubare toro sine amore secundo / prodest cum fletu nox evigilanda venit?*. Once again, the form chosen is the priamel (cf. Race, *Classical Priamel*, p. 130; Lygd. 2.1–6 [comm.]): A) catalogue of symbols of wealth (ll. 11–19a) and philosophical justification of the scorning of wealth: it attracts envy, brings worry and cannot escape the vicissitudes of fortune (ll. 19b–22); B) consequently, the elegiac poet, like the philosopher, prefers the certainty of poverty, but poverty in the company of his beloved (ll. 23–24). In fact, this second block of the elegy clearly functions as an argument (*nam*, l. 11) for the prologue-block (ll. 1–10), that is, it is an explanation for the poet's surprising attitude in asking the gods, not for wealth as everyone else does, but for love. Observe, too, how the poet goes out of his way to achieve the greatest variety possible in the catalogue of wealth.

11–12: gold and farmland are also combined in the context of contempt for wealth in Tib. 1.1.1–2, *divitias alius fulvo sibi congerat auro / et teneat culti iugera multa soli*; Prop. 3.5.3 and 5, *nec tamen inviso pectus mihi carpitur auro /. . ./ nec mihi mille iugis Campania pinguis aratur.*

11 nam: like Tibullus and the rest of the *Corp. Tib.* Lygdamus strikingly uses only the particle *nam* (cf. Lygd. 3.22; 4.36; 43; 85), never *enim*, even though the extensive use that Ovid makes of the latter

particle in epic guarantees its poetic tone (cf. Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, pp. 122–123).

grave . . . pondus . . . divitis auri: the term *pondus*, as a unit of weight, could equally denote an exact amount, equivalent to one pound, in which case it is always accompanied by a numeral (cf. Mart. 7.53.12, *argenti pondera quinque*), or indicate, as here, an indeterminate weight. The combination *grave . . . pondus* is not attested anywhere else. The usual formula to express "a great weight, amount, mass" is *magnum pondus*; cf. Sisen. *Hist.* 101, *abunde semper usi magnum pondus auri argentique*; Nep. *Epam.* 4.1, *hic magno pondere auri Thebas venit*; Cic. *Fam.* 10.32.1, *magno cum pondere auri, maiore argenti coacto de publicis exactionibus*; *Phil.* 2.66, *permagnum optimi pondus argenti*; Ov. *Her.* 17.226, *congestoque auri pondere dives ero* (scil. *Helena*); Liv. 24.45.9, *auri . . . magnum pondus*; or, occasionally, *grande pondus*, cf. Cic. *Verr.* 1.45, *ex aede Minervae grande auri pondus ablatum*; 91, *argenti optimi caelati grande pondus secum tulerat*; for other possibilities, cf. Cic. *Sest.* 93, *innumerabile pondus auri*; Hor. *Sat.* 1.1.41, *quid iuvat inmensum te argenti pondus et auri / . . .?*; *OLD pondus* 1c.

quid prodest . . . ?: see the commentary on l. 1.

pondus . . . divitis auri: for the expression, cf. Tib. 1.9.31–32, *nullo . . . divitis auri / pondere*; for *divitis auri/* at the end of a hexameter, cf. also Manil. 5.16, *Hesperidumque vigil custos, et divitis auri/*; *Laus Pis.* 219. The combination *divitis auri* ultimately goes back to Tibullus; cf. also 1.10.7, *divitis hoc vitium est auri.*

12: what is striking about this line is that a conditional clause takes the place of the second subject of *quid prodest*, while coordinated with the first subject, *grave pondus*. However, the case is not exceptional. Other examples are: Prop. 2.3.9–15, *nec me tam facies . . . cepit, . . . nec . . . comae . . ., non oculi . . ., nec si qua Arabio lucet bombyce puella*; Stat. *Silv.* 5.3.41–43, *Sicanii non mitius halat / aura croci; dites nec si tibi rara Sabaei / cinnama, odoratas nec Arabs decerpsit aristas.* Moreover, this possibility of occupying the position of the subject is not confined to the conditional clause but is open to other conjunctions, like *quod* (Prop. 2.3.17; Ov. *Tr.* 5.2.65 ff.) and *cum* (cf. Prop. 2.3.19 and 21; Tib. 1.2.31–32). As regards the formulation of the line, cf. both Hor. *Od.* 1.1.11–12, *patrios findere sarculo agros*, and Prop. 3.5.5, *nec mihi mille iugis Campania pinguis aratur*; cf. also Hor. *Epod.* 1.25–26, *non ut iuvencis illigata pluribus / aratra nitantur meis.*

arva . . . pinguia: for the application of the adjective *pinguis* in the sense of *fertilis* to cultivatable land, cf. Lucr. 5.1248, *agros pinguis*;

Verg. *Ge.* 1.64, *pingue solum*; 2.92, *pinguibus . . . terris*; 184, *pinguis humus*; 203, *pinguis . . . terra*; 274, *pinguis agros . . . campi*; 4.118, *pinguis hortos*; *Aen.* 6.195, *pinguem . . . humum*; Tib. 2.3.6, *versarem valido pingue bidente solum*; Prop. 3.5.5, *Campania pinguis*; Val.-Flac. 7.607–608, *pinguia Nili / fertilis arva*; *OLD pinguis* 3b; cf. also Verg. *Ge.* 1.492, *pinguescere campos* ("to fertilize"). In the *Georgics*, *pinguis* is frequently a technical term to describe a certain type of soil, "dense" as opposed to the "light" variety (*levis terra*); cf. 2.92; 248–250, *pinguis item quae sit tellus hoc denique pacto / discimus: haud unquam manibus iactata fatiscit, / sed picis in morem ad digitos lentescit habendo*; on the importance of this adjective Virgil's agricultural works, cf. Thomas 70 *ad* Verg. *Ge.* 1.8.

findant: the verb *findere* is used here to describe the action of ploughing the land; cf. Cic. *Arat.* 118, *nequeunt radices findere terras*; Hor. *Od.* 1.1.1, *findere sarculos agros*; Tib. 1.2.45, (*saga*) *cantu findit . . . solum* (= Ov. *Am.* 1.8.18); Ov. *Her.* 12.94, *solidam iusso vomere findis humum*; *Ars* 2.671, *aut mare remigiis aut vomere findite terras*; Claud. 3.382; *ThLL* 6.1.768.33–54. Nisbet-Hubbard (9 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 1.1.11), in addition to the present passage of Lygdamus, quote Sol. 1.47, ἄλλος γῆν τήμνων; A.R. 1.628, πυροφόρους τε διατμήξασθαι ἀρουράς. On Latin verbs for "ploughing" in the *sermo poeticus*, cf. Lygd. 3.5 *renovarent* (comm.).

mille boves: for *mille* (Gr. μύριοι) to denote an indefinite high number (= "innumerable"), cf. eg Tib. 1.3.50; 2.3.44; 4.60; [Tib.] 3.8.14; 12.12; Prop. 3.5.5; Ov. *Am.* 1.3.15; 2.8.1; 2.18.10; 3.14.24; *Her.* 7.123; *Ars* 1.63; 3.435; *Rem.* 526, *mille mali species*; *Met.* 1.443; 2.452; 3.522; 5.157 (with Bömer 263); Pers. 5.52, *mille hominum species*; Stat. *Silv.* 4.6.20, *mille . . . species aerisque eborisque*; also in prose, cf. eg Plin. *Nat.* 36.2, *mille genera marmorum*. In this connection, see Ed. Wölfflin, "*Sescenti, mille, centum, trecenti* als unbestimmte und runde Zahlen", *ALL* 9 (1896) 177–192 (esp. pp. 180–184); W. Heraeus, *ibid.*, p. 597 (*millia* with genitive); R. G. Kent, "Latin *Mīlle* and Certain Other Numerals", *TAPhA* 42 (1911) 69–89; Hofmann-Szantyr 211 (§ 113 a); *ThLL* 8.980.69 ff. A similar usage indicating rounded and indefinite figures (= *multi, innumeri*) is found with *centum* (eg Ov. *Am.* 1.14.13; 2.4.10; Serv. *Aen.* 6.43, *ostia centum: finitus numerus pro infinito*; *ThLL* 3.827.77 ff.), *ducenti, trecenti* (cf. Fordyce 115–116 *ad* Catul. 9.1; Kiessling-Heinze 281 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 3.4.79; Kay 147 *ad* Mart. 11.35.1), *quingenti* and *sescenti* (Pl. *Trin.* 791; Cic. *Att.* 7.2.3; Mart. 6.59.2; 9.37.9; 11.65.1 [with Kay 211]); in general, see bibl. cited above.

For the motif of "innumerable heads of cattle" as a conspicuous

sign of infinite wealth or prosperity, cf. Hor. *Epod.* 1.25–26, *non ut* ***iuvencis*** *illigata* ***pluribus*** */ aratra nitantur meis*; Verg. *Ecl.* 2.21, ***mille*** *meae Siculis errant in montibus* ***agnae***; Tib. 2.3.41–42, *praedator cupit inmensos obsidere campos / ut multa* ***innumera*** *iugera pascat* ***ove***; Prop. 3.5.5, *nec mihi mille iugis Campania pinguis aratur* (pointed to above as a possible model); 4.1.129, *tua cum* ***multi*** *versarent rura* ***iuvenci***; Ov. *Met.* 13.824, *pauperis est numerare pecus!* Note, too, the relationship between *pecus* and *pecunia.*

13–16: In these lines Lygdamus picks up and develops the *marmoreum tectum* of l. 3. No doubt, any Roman citizen belonging to the social élite would have a luxurious mansion built for himself in Rome, as a display of wealth and also an outward symbol of his social prestige. Lying behind the detailed description of this luxurious mansion, with its tall columns of foreign marble in different colours (ll. 13–14), its ample gardens (l. 15), its gold-coffered ceilings (l. 16a) and marble flooring (l. 16b), is mainly Prop. 3.2.11–14, *quod non Taenariis domus est mihi fulta columnis, / nec camera auratas inter eburna trabes, / nec mea Phaeacas aequant pomaria silvas, / non operosa rigat Marcius antra liquor*, a passage which in turn Fedeli *Prop. III* 98 traces back to Hor. *Od.* 2.18.1–5, *non ebur neque aureum / mea renidet in domo lacunar, / non trabes Hymettiae / premunt columnas ultima recisas / Africa.* The image thus already formed part of an established scheme to express the rejection of the unflagging pursuit of wealth, either in favour of the ataraxia of the wise man (cf. Lucr. 2.26 ff., *nec domus argento fulget auroque renidet / nec citharae reboant laqueata aurataque templa . . .*), or the carefree life of the country (cf. Verg. *Ge.* 2.458–467, (*o fortunatos . . . / agricolas! . . . / . . . / si non ingentem foribus domus alta superbis / mane salutantum totis vomit aedibus undam, / nec varios inhiat pulchra testudine postis / inlusasque auro vestis Ephyreiaque aera, / alba neque Assyrio fucatur lana veneno, nec casia liquidi corrumpitur usus olivi; at secura quies . . .*), or in favour of a poorly-rewarded career in poetry (cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.18.1–5 *sup. cit.*; Prop. 3.2.11–14 *sup. cit.;* Nisbet-Hubbard *Hor. II* 292–293). For columns, gold-coffered ceilings and marble floors as symbols of luxury in a mansion, see the transformation undergone by the humble cottage of Philemon and Baucis in Ov. *Met.* 8.609–702. On the luxury of Roman dwellings, villas and gardens, cf. Friendländer 823–842.

The whole passage of Lygdamus (ll. 13–16) is imitated in *Anthol. Lat. Burmann.* III ep. 70. T. I p. 511 (= *AL* 443 Riese), *quod tua mille domus solidas habet columnas, / quod tua marmoreo ianua poste nitet, / aurea quod summo splendent laquearia tecto, / imum crusta tegit quod pretiosa solum*

(*solum* Heinsius : *locum* codd.), / *atria quod circa dives* †*tegit* (*citro dives tenet* Heinsius) *omnia cultus: / hoc animos tollit nempe, beate, tuos? / aedibus in totis gemmae licet omnia claudant, / turpe est, nil domino turpius esse suo.*
13–14: To the marble from Taenarum mentioned in his Propertian model (3.2.11 *sup. cit.*), Lygdamus adds that of Phrygia and Carystos. According to a fragment of Nepos (in Plin. *Nat.* 36.48 [= Nep. *frg.* 24 P.) Mamurra, Caesar's unspeakable *praefectus fabrum*, had previously had his mansion decorated with columns of Carystian marble, although this type of marble is only mentioned quite late on in Roman literature (cf. Blümner, *Technologie* III, p. 48; Marquardt, *Privatleben* II, p. 621): first in Sen. *Tro.* 836, *ferax varii lapidis Carystos*, and later on numerous occasions (in the two Plinies, Martial and, above all, Statius). But it is not only this that suggests a late dating for the Lygdamus cycle, as authors like Martial and Statius also mention Carystian marble in their verses in conjunction with the Laconian and Phrygian varieties; cf. Mart. 9.75.7–9, *de marmore omni, quod Carystos invenit, / quod Phrygia Synnas, Afra quod Nomas lavit / et quod virenti fonte lavit Eurotas*; Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.148–150, *hic Libycus Phrygiusque silex, hic dura Laconum / saxa virent, hic flexus onyx et concolor alto / vena mari* (scil. *marmor ab Carysto*); Phrygian marble also appears alongside Carystian in Stat. *Silv.* 1.5.34; 4.2.27. Cf. Axelson, "Geburtsjahr", pp. 291–292 (together with the reply by Büchner, "Lygdamus", pp. 96–97); Tränkle 94–96.

On the subject of the possession of private colonnades and porticos as an ostentation of luxury, with the subsequent moral condemnation that came with it, cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.15.16; 18.6 (with Nisbet-Hubbard 250 and 294); Tib. 2.3.43–44; Prop. 3.2.11; Petr. *Satyr.* 77.7, *aedificavi hanc domum . . .; habet quattuor cenationes, cubicula viginti, porticus marmoratos duos . . .*; Juv. 7.178 and 182 (with Mayor 316); 14.307; Hier. *Ep.* 14.6. For the frequent mention of columns in Statius in encomiastic terms as a symbol of luxury, in both temples and palaces, in stark contrast to the traditional condemnation of them in Cynical diatribe and Augustan poetry, cf. Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.152; 3.1.5–6a; 97b–110a, *longo tu tramite nudos / texisti scopulos, fueratque ubi semita tantum / nunc tibi distinctis stat porticus alta columnis, ne sorderet iter*; 5.90 (with Laguna 384–385).
13 domus . . . innixa columnis/: the expression is from technical language; cf. Ov. *Ponto* 3.2.49, *templa . . . vastis* ***innixa columnis/***; Stat. *Silv.* 4.2.38–39 (referring to tables), *Indisque* ***innixa columnis*** */ robora Maurorum* (with Coleman 94–95); *ThLL* 7.1.1698.31 ff.; another possible combination is with *fulcere*; cf. Prop. 3.2.11, *domus . . . fulta*

columnis; Luc. *Civ.* 5.515, *domus, non ullo robore fulta*; Juv. 7.182 (*domus*) *fulta columnis.*

Marble columns were another conventional symbol of luxury; cf. Ar. *Nu.* 815, ἀλλ' ἔσθι' ἐλθὼν τοὺς Μεγακλέους κίονας; Hor. *Od.* 2.18.4; *Ep.* 1.10.22; [Sen.] *Epigr.* 51.1; H. Blümner, *Römische Privataltertümer* (Munich 1911) 92. The Romans combined different varieties of marble in search of polychromy; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 35.1, *coepimus et lapide pingere. Hoc Claudii principatu inventum, Neronis vero maculas, quae non essent in crustis, inserendo unitatem variare, ut ovatus esset Numidicus, ut purpura distinguiretur Synnadicus, qualiter illos nasci optassent deliciae*; Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.148–149; 2.2.85 ff. (a catalogue of seven types of marble); 3.1.99–100a, *nunc tibi* ***distinctis*** *stat porticus alta* ***columnis****, ne sorderet iter* (with Laguna 162); 5.36 ff.; 4.2.26–29; Mart. 6.42.11 ff.; 9.75.6–9; Lucianus *Hipp.* 5. As regards the foreign origin of these marble columns, (cf. Tib. 2.4.43, *lapis externus*), the importing of luxuries from afar was conventionally deplored by the moralists; cf. Philo *Somn.* 2.8.54, τί δὲ 'Ασίαν καὶ Λιβύην καὶ πᾶσαν Εὐρώπην καὶ τὰς νήσους ἐπερχοόμεθα, κίονας ἀριστίνδην ἐπιλελεγμένους καὶ ἐπιστυλίδας ἐρευνῶντες; Sen. *Ep.* 114.9; 115.8, *ingentium maculae columnarum, sive ex Aegyptiis harenis sive ex Africae solitudinibus advectae*; Musonius *Frg.* 19 p. 108 H.; J. C. Bramble, *Persius and the Programmatic Satire* (Cambridge 1974) 110 n. 1; Nisbet-Hubbard 294 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 2.18.4 *sup. cit.* However, it was precisely because of their far-flung origins that they were highly prized; cf. Hdt. 3.106.1, αἱ δ' ἐσχατιαί κως τῆς οἰκεομένης τὰ κάλλιστα ἔλαχον; Gnoli, *Marmora Romana*, p. 10. Pliny the Elder devotes a good part of book XXXVI of his *Natural History* (§§ 1–125) to the study of marble; of particular interest for this elegy are the following chapters: diatribe against *luxuria in marmoribus* (§§ 1–8); diatribe against the use of coloured marble (§§ 44–46); history of decoration with marble (§§ 47–54); list of famous marbles (§§ 54–63); luxuriousness of stately mansions as contrasted with the frugality of the early Romans (§§ 109–112). On the varieties and types of marble in the Roman period, cf. F. Braemer, "Les marbres à l'époque romaine", *RA* 1 (1971) 167–174.

Phrygiis . . . columnis: Phrygian marble, white with reddish veins, was highly-prized by the ancients, in particular the so-called *lapis Synnadicus*, which came from the Phrygian city of *Synnada* (or *Synnas*), near present-day Afyon Karahisar. This type of marble, called 'pavonazzetto' by Italian masons, is mentioned, apart from Lygdamus, by Strabo (12.8.14 p. 577), Horace (cf. Porph. *Od.* 3.1.41), Pliny the Elder (*Nat.* 35.1; 36.143), Juvenal (14.307) and Statius (*Silv.* 1.5.37;

2.2.87, *Synnade quod moesta Phrygiae fodere secures / per Cybeles lugentis agros: ubi marmore picto / candida purpureo distinguitur area gyro*; 5.36). On the death of Agrippa, the quarries of Phrygia passed into imperial hands; cf. L. Robert, "Lettres Byzantines. Les Kordakia de Nicée, le combustible de Synnada et les poissons-scies. Sur les lettres d'un métropolite de Phrygie au Xe siècle. Philologie et réalités II", *Journal des Savants* (1962) 13–17; 19–33; J. Ward-Perkins, *EAA* IV, p. 861, n° 7; R. Martil, *Manuel d'Architecture* I, p. 144. *Phrygius lapis* in connection with the motif of *divitiae operosae* is also mentioned by Horace in *Od.* 3.1.41. For the phrase, cf. Plin. *Nat.* 36.102, *nonne inter magnifica Basilicam Paulli columnis e Phrygibus mirabilem, Fortumque Divi Augusti* (with Rouveret 197).

Phrygiis: the Romans used the name of Phrygia to refer to that part of the central and western region of Asia Minor where Troy was situated.

innixa columnis: the same hexameter-ending is found in Ov. *Ponto* 3.2.49 and Stat. *Silv.* 4.2.38; *columnis* always closes the hexameter (cf. *fulta columnis* in Prop. 3.2.11; Juv. 7.182).

13b–14 columnis, / . . . tuis, . . . tuis: probably datives, the usual case taken by the verb *innitor*, although there are also clear cases of the ablative (cf. *OLD innitor*, *ThLL*).

14 Taenare: promontory in the south of Laconia and city of the same name, today Cape Matapan. The place was famous in Antiquity for its temple to Poseidon (cf. Prop. 1.13.22, *Taenarius . . . deus*; with Fedeli 313), for the location there, according to popular imagination, of one of the entrances to the underworld (cf. Pi. *P.* 4.43–44; E. *HF* 23–24; Verg. *Ge.* 4.467, *Taenarias . . . fauces, alta atria Ditis* [with Mynors 316]; Hor. *Od.* 1.34.10 [with Nisbet-Hubbard 382]; Ov. *Met.* 10.13, (*Orpheus*) *ad Styga Taenaria est ausus descendere porta* (with Bömer 19); Sen. *Oed.* 171; *Her. f.* 587; Luc. *Civ.* 6.648; 9.36; Stat. *Theb.* 1.96; Hyg. *Fab.* 79.2; cf. *RE* 4 A. 457 ff.), and also for its marble quarries; cf. Str. 8.5.7; Prop. 3.2.11, *quod non Taenariis domus es mihi fulta columnis*; Plin. *Nat.* 36.135 and 158, *Taenarium . . . lapidem*; Mart. 6.42.11–13, *illic Taygeti* (scil. *ab Laconia*) *virent metalla / et certant vario decore saxa, / quae Phryx et Libys altius cecidit*; Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.148, *hic Libycus, Phrygiusque silex, hic dura Laconum saxa virent*; 5.40; Mart. 1.55, *Spartani . . . saxi*. As for the colour of this *Taenarius lapis*, Fedeli 99 *ad* Prop. 3.2.11 mentions three types: the black (cf. Plin. *Nat.* 36.135 and 158), the 'fior di persico' (cf. Sext. Emp. *Pyrrh. Hyp.* 130), and the 'rosso antico' (cf. Str. 8.5.7). Bölte (*RE* IV A2 [1932] 2036) and

Shackleton Bailey (*Propertiana*, p. 138) argue that Prop. 3.2.11 refers to this last variety. For Lygd. 3.14, Fedeli 99 *ad* Prop. 3.2.11 argues for the same colour, while Tränkle opts for black (p. 95 *ad loc.*). Pliny the Elder, in *Nat.* 36.158 (with Rouveret 223), mentions two types of marble from Taenarum, one red and the other black (*Taenarium lapidem et Phoeniceum et haematiten . . .; ex alio Taenario, qui niger est, . . .*). The red type seems to have been quarried from very early times, the black only at a late date; cf. R. Martin, *Manuel d'Architecture*, p. 144 and n. 9.
14 Caryste: town on the south coast of the island of Euboea, renowned for the quality of its marbles, which are mentioned by Strabo (10.1.6) and Pliny the Elder (4.64, *notior tamen marmore Carystio*; 36.48, *marmore columnam . . . e Carystio* [with Rouveret 171]). This is the so-called 'cipollino' marble, with parallel white (or pale grey) and green lines, like the head of an onion, whence the technical term in Italian 'cipollino', "small onion" ('cipolla' = "onion"); to Statius, however, it was like sea water (cf. *Silv.* 1.2.149–150, *concolor alto / vena mari*; 5.34; 2.2.93, *hic Nomadum lucent flaventia saxa Thasosque / et Chios et gaudens fluctus aequare Carystos*). On this type of marble, cf. Plin. *Ep.* 5.6.36, *columellae Carystiae*; Mart. 9.75.6–9, *extruit thermas / de marmore omni, quod Carystos invenit, / quod Phrygia Synnas, Afra quod Nomas misit / et quod virenti fonte lavit Eurotas*; Sen. *Tro.* 835, *an ferax varii lapidis Carystos?*; von Geisau, "Karystos", *RE* 10.2 (1919) 2257 ('Cipollino'); Ch. Dubois, *Études sur l'administration et l'explotation des carrières dans le monde romain*, pp. 115 ff.; R. Martin, *Manuel d'Architecture*, p. 144 and n. 7; Ioh. Papageorgakis, Πρακτικὰ τῆς 'Ακαδ. 'Αθην. 39 (1964) 262–284; V. Hankey, "A marble quarry at Karystos", *BMB* 18 (1965) 53–59, fig. 1–20.
15: there is mention of these splendid gardens, which were like small woods growing between the columns of the *impluvium*, as an outward sign of luxury in Hor. *Od.* 3.10.5–6, *nemus inter pulchra satum tecta*, and *Ep.* 1.10.22, *inter varias nutritur silva columnas*; Prop. 3.2.13.

sacros . . . lucos: for the term *lucus* 'strictiore sensu' (= grove sacred to a deity), cf. Serv. *Aen.* 1.310, *lucus enim est arborum multitudo cum religione, nemus vero composita multitudo arborum, silva diffusa et inculta*; 446, *sacrum templum, quod in luco, id est in loco sacro, conditur*; Char. p. 393.7B, *lucus: locus fulmine ictus et arborum spissitate tectus*; *ThLL* 7.2.1751.52–63. A sacred grove is typically very old (*vetus*) and shady (*praenubilus*), thanks to the denseness of its trees: the presence of a *numen* protects it from the woodcutter's axe (*incaedua silva*); cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.1.1–2; 13.7–8; *Fasti* 3.295. In fact, adjectives like *opacus* (eg

Varro *Men.* 322), *frondosus* (eg Verg. *Ge.* 4.543), *viridis* (eg Verg. *Aen.* 7.800; Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.94) and *umbrosus* (eg Hor. *Od.* 1.4.11) figure among the *epitheta notabiliora* of the term *lucus* in *ThLL* 7.2.1753.84–1754.20. It may be assumed, then, that the gardens and orchards of well-to-do Roman citizens were of similar characteristics: an exuberant mass of lofty trees offering intense shade; recall the grove belonging to the wealthy Tullus in Prop. 1.14.5–6, *et nemus unde altas intendat vertice silvas, / urgetur quantis Caucasus arboribus*; cf. also Hor. *Od.* 3.10.5–6, *nemus inter pulchra satum tecta*; *Ep.* 1.10.22–23, *nempe inter varias nutritur silva columnas: / laudaturque domus, longos quae prospicit agros.* In Prop. 3.2.13 (with Fedeli 99–100) the luxuriance of these gardens in stately mansions is compared with the fabulous gardens of Alcinous, a proverbial symbol of luxury (see the commentary on l. 24 *regum munera*); in *Silv.* 3.1.94 Statius refers to the luxuriant gardens of the numerous *villae* of Pollius Felix by the metaphorical term *tot virides lucos*, no doubt using *lucus* as a term of praise to highlight the gardens as a symbol of luxury. As for the coincidence of *lucus* and *nemus* in the same line, and the clear distinction in meaning, cf. Prop. 4.9.24, *lucus ubi umbroso fecerat orbe nemus* and the examples cited by Fedeli *Prop.* IV 226 and Shackleton Bailey *Prop.* 258 *ad loc.*: Ov. *Ars* 3.689, *silva nemus non alta facit*; Sen. *Her. O.* 956–958, *claudite Elysium mihi, / quaecumque fidae coniuges nemoris sacri / lucos tenetis*; 1636, *nullique priscum profuit luco nemus*; Sil. 6.146–147, *lucus . . . servabat sine sole nemus*; Stat. *Ach.* 1.539–540, *lucus Agenorei sublimis ad orgia Bacchi / stabat et admissum caelo nemus*; Paul. *Fest.* 159 L., *nemora significant silvas amoenas*; Aus. *Ep.* 29.67, *nemoralibus . . . lucis*; Sid. *Carm.* 24.66, *qua nemus reflexum . . . non lucum arboribus facit, sed antrum*; Isid. *Orig.* 17.6.6–7, *sunt . . . nemora arbores maiores, umbrosae frondibus. Lucus est densitas arborum solo lucem detrahens.*

sacros: ie *dis dedicatum atque consecratum.* By definition, *sacrum* is the opposite of *profanum* (cf. Fest. p. 256 L., *profanum quod non est sacrum*). When the jurist Trebatius Testa, a contemporary and friend of Cicero's and author of a treatise *De religionibus*, wishes to give a positive definition of *sacrum*, he defines the word in relation to the gods: *sacrum . . . quicquid est quod deorum habetur* (Trebatius *apud* Macrob. *Sat.* 3.3.2). Aelius Gallus, another Augustan jurist, gives the following definition, transmitted by Festus (p. 424 L.): *sacrum . . . quod dis dedicatum atque consecratum sit. Sacrum*, then, is anything pertaining to the gods by virtue of a consecration; cf. R. Schilling, "L'originalité du vocabulaire religieux latin", *Rites, cultes, dieux de Rome*, Paris: Klincksiek 1979, pp. 49–51 (= *RBPh* 49 [1971] 50–52); "*Sacrum* et *profanum*. Essai

d'interprétation", *Rites, . . .*, pp. 54–70 (= *Latomus* 30 [1971] 953–969).

imitantia: there is a similar use in connection with the luxury of stately *villae* in Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.93–96a, *nostro qui tot fastigia monti, / tot virides lucos, tot saxa imitantia vultus / aeraque, tot scripto viventes lumine ceras / fixisti?* It was an obsession and caprice of the rich to reproduce reality as faithfully as possible in their mansions. Note how Lygdamus respects the position within the hexameter where Ovid likes to place the participles of *imitari*, after the hephthemimeral caesura; cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.4.15; *Ars* 1.439; 2.569; *Her.* 4.91; 13.41; *Fasti* 5.157; *Met.* 2.2 (with Bömer 238); 8.736; 9.340; 481; 783; 10.106; 11.613; 626, *somnia, quae veras aequant imitantia formas/*; 13.252; 818, *imitantia ceras/*; 14.521; *Ponto* 1.2.43, *somnia me terrent veros imitantia casus/*; 2.1.37; *Hal.* 111; cf. also Ov. *Am.* 3.14.13, *imitare pudicas/*; *Her.* 14.57, *imitare sorores/*; *Rem.* 497, *imitare furores/*; *Met.* 10.206, *imitabere nostros/*; 11.638, *imitatur; at alter/*; *Ibis* 435, *veros imitere iuvencos/.*

16: for the formulation of this line, cf. Cic. *Par.* 49, *aurata tecta in villis et sola marmorea*, or the catalogue of external signs of luxury in Hor. *Od.* 2.18.1–5, *non ebur neque aureum / mea renidet in domo lacunar; / non trabes Hymettiae / premunt columnas ultima recisas / Africa* (ie Numidian marble). Ovid also mentions the two luxuries together in the same line; cf. *Met.* 15.672, *marmoreumque solum fastigiaque aurea*; cf. M. Bonjour, "*Nunc aurea Roma est.* A propos d'une image ovidienne", in A. Thill (ed.), *L'Élegie romaine. Enracinement. Thèmes. Diffusion*, Paris 1980, pp. 221–230.

aurataeque trabes: for the phrase, cf. Prop. 3.2.10, *camera auratas inter eburna trabes*; Stat. *Silv.* 1.3.35, *auratasne trabes*; Sen. *Thy.* 231, *regem non faciunt opes . . . non auro nitidae trabes*, and 646–648, *fulget hic turbae capax / inmane tectum, cuius auratas trabes / variis columnae nobiles maculis ferunt.*

Coffered ceilings (*laquear* or *lacunar*) in private mansions were a great symbol of luxury, and they were frequently lined with gold cloth and inlaid with ivory. Although in the Greek comedies and tragedies that have come down to us there is, surprisingly, no mention of any of this gold-adorned coffering (perhaps simply a matter of chance in comedy [with the possible exception of Ar. *Sch.* 1215; Diph. *Fr.* 61] and to avoid anachronism in tragedy), in Latin literature there is abundant testimony from an early date; alongside the passages cited above, cf. Enn. *Scen.* 94–96 V. (= 89–91 J.), *vidi ego te adstante ope barbarica / tectis caelatis laqueatis / auro ebore instructam regifice* (with Jocelyn 249); Lucr. 2.28, *nec citharae reboant laqueata aurataque templa*; Cic. *Leg.* 2.2, *pavimenta marmorea et tecta laqueata contemno*; *Par.* 49 (*sup. cit.*); *Tusc.* 5.62; Hor. *Od.* 2.16.11–12, *laqueata . . . tecta* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 260);

18.1–2, *sup. cit.* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 293); Verg. *Aen.* 1.726, *laquearibus aureis* (with Austin 217); [Verg.] *Cul.* 63–64, *Attalicis opibus data vellera, si nitor auri / sub laqueare domus animum non angit avarum*; Prop. 3.2.10 *sup. cit.*; Ov. *Met.* 8.564, *summa lacunabant alterno murice conchae* (with Bömer 174); 702, *aurataque tecta*; Sen. *Nat. Quaest.* 1 *praef.* 8, *contemnere porticus et lacunaria ebore fulgentia*; *Ep.* 90.42, (*non impendiebant*) *caelata laquearia*; 115.9; *Thy.* 457; *Phaed.* 496–497; Apul. *Flor.* 23 p. 103, *lacunaria auro oblita*; Plu. *Lyc.* 13; Prud. *Perist.* 11.219–220, *ordo columnarum geminus laquearia tecti / sustinet, auratis suppositus trabibus*; 12.49, *bratteolas trabibus sublevit*; cf. Blümner, *Römische Privaltertümer*, pp. 94–95; Ebert, *RE* 12.369.36 ff.; C. W. Mendell, *YClS* 11 (1950) 285 ff. The image goes back ultimately to B. *Fr.* 20.13 B. χρυσῷ δ' ἐλέφαντί τε μαρμαίρουσιν οἶκοι. Gold and ivory were often mentioned together in descriptions of luxurious houses (cf. Nisbet-Hubbard *Hor. I* 351, *II* 293). The motif of the rejection of gold and ivory was a favourite one in diatribe and in the moralists who sang the praises of the simple life; cf. Lucr. 2.28; Philo *Somn.* 2.8.55; Sen. *Dial.* 12.10.7; Plin. *Nat.* 33.57, *laquearia quae nunc et in privatis domibus auro teguntur post Carthaginem eversam primo in Capitolio inaurata sunt censura L. Mummi*; Muson. *Frg.* 20, p. 108 Hense; [Lucian.] *Cyn.* 9; Mendell *YClS* 11 (1950) 285 ff.; Nisbet-Hubbard *Od.* I 351–352; II 293; Nisbet *CR* 85 (1971) 58. On the thickness of the sheets of gold with which the Romans lined their coffered ceilings there is contradictory information. Most of the authors speak of solid gold; cf. Luc. *Civ.* 10.112–113, *laqueataque tecta ferebant / divitias, crassumque trabes absconderat aurum*; Stat. *Theb.* 1.114, *crasso laquearia fulva metallo*; Sen. *Ep.* 90.9, *lacunaria auro gravia*; *Phaed.* 494–496, *mille non quaerit tegi / dives columnis; nec trabes multo insolens / suffigit auro*; Sen. *Contr.* 9, *infusum tectis aurum.* However, other authors refer to the extreme thinness of these sheets of gold; cf. Ov. *Ars* 3.231–232, *aurea quae pendent* (*splendent* alii) *ornato signa theatro, / inspice quam tenuis* (*contemnes* alii) *brattea ligna tegit.* Martial uses the term *sputum* to refer to this *brattea* in 8.33.11.

marmoreumque solum: the identical phrase occurs in Ov. *Met.* 15.672 (cf. 8.702, *adoperta marmore tellus*; cf. Cic. *Par.* 49, *sola marmorea*). The luxury of the flooring in stately mansions is dealt with in Sen. *Dial.* (*De tranqu. animi*) 1.9; cf. also Cic. *Leg.* 2.2, *pavimenta marmorea et laqueata tecta contemno.*

17–18: Lygdamus here makes use of another well-known poetic device to allude to riches, by mentioning the expensive and exotic products from the east, an authentic proverbial symboi of luxury among the

Romans. He mentions two in particular, pearls (l. 17) and purple (l. 18). The catalogue of these exotic oriental products already enjoyed a long elegiac tradition within the recurring motif in the elegiac poets of the curse of the *dives amator* and the *munera* demanded of the *pauperes poetae* with voracious assiduity by their *avarae puellae*; cf. Navarro, *Amada codiciosa*, pp. 12–14 (≈ *Habis* 22 [1991] 211–212).
17: the reference here is to the extraction of pearls. The place best known to the Romans for this activity was the Red Sea, understood *lato sensu* as all the eastern waters between Suez and Sri Lanka (cf. Plin. *Nat.* 9.106, *Indicus maxime has mittit oceanus*; Amm. 23.6.85, *apud Indos et Persas margaritae reperiuntur in testis marinis robustis et candidis*), but in particular the Persian Gulf (cf. Plin. *Nat.* 9.106, *praecipue autem laudantur circa Arabiam in Persico sinu maris Rubri*). For the formulation of the line, cf. Prop. 3.13.6, *et venit e Rubro concha Erycina salo*, and Tib. 2.4.30, *e Rubro lucida concha mari*, as well as Ov. *Ars* 3.124, *lectaque diverso litore concha venit*; [Tib.] 3.8.19–20, *et quascumque niger Rubro de litore gemmas / proximus Eois colligit Indus aquis*; Prop. 1.14.12, *et legiturque Rubris gemma sub aequoribus*; also Mart. 8.28.14, *Erythraeis eruta gemma vadis*; 9.12.5, *Erythraeis . . . lapillis*; Stat. *Silv.* 4.6.18, *Erythraeae Thetidis . . . lapillis* (with Coleman 180). On the topos of pearls and precious stones in the seas and rivers of the east, cf. also Prop. 4.5.21, *si te Eoa Dorozantum iuvat aurea ripa*; Curt. 8.9.19, *gemmas margaritasque mare litoribus infundit*; as well as the numerous examples in *ThLL* 6.1755.73 ff. On the distribution of pearl fishing grounds in the ancient world, see Hans Rommel, *RE* 14.2 (1930) 1687–1689.

Erythraeo . . . litore: *Erythraeum litus* here denotes a more extensive geographical area than we understand today by the Red Sea, and which covers all the north-eastern part of the Indian Ocean, including the Persian Gulf (*Persicus Sinus*) and the Red Sea (*Arabicus Sinus*). The Romans can be said to have extended to all the eastern and non-Mediterranean waters what was originally a specific denomination (cf. Goodyear and Koestermann I.370 *ad* Tac. *Ann.* 2.61.2, *claustra olim Romani imperii, quod nunc rubrum ad mare patescit*). In fact, there is an abundance of evidence of a use 'sensu strictiore' (cf. Plin. *Nat.* 6.143, *Arabia, inter duo maria Rubrum Persicumque procurrens*). For the use 'sensu lato', cf. Mart. 7.30.4, *navigat a rubris . . . niger Indus aquis.*

The striking designation of the Indian Ocean as *Erythraeum litus* ('Ερυθρὴ Θάλαττα) is not attested in poetry, as is shown by Axelson ("Geburtsjahr", pp. 291–292; cf. Tränkle 96–97) before the Flavian period, which is extremely enlightening as far as the date of compo-

sition of the Lygdamus cycle is concerned (*pace* Büchner, "Lygdamus", p. 97). The earliest example of this adjective applied to the Indian Ocean is from the Flavian period and is found in prose: Plin. *Nat.* 12.70, (*pretium murrae*) *Erythraeae XVI—hanc volunt Arabicam intellegi*, on the subject of Arabian myrrh from the coasts of the Indian Ocean. In Martial this adjective appears at least 7 times (cf. 5.37.4; 8.28.14, *Erythraeis eruta gemmas vadis*; 9.2.9; 9.12[13].5; 10.17[16].5, *quidquid Erythraea niger invenit Indus in alga*) and in Statius at least twice (cf. *Silv.* 4.6.18; *Theb.* 7.566, *Erythraeis victor ab oris*), in both authors generally in connection with pearls and their extraction (6 of the 9 times). The relationship between the adjective *Erythraeus* and the Indian Ocean is quite clear in Mart. 13.100.2, (*venatio*) *dentis Erythraei* (referring to the Indian elephant). Prior to this innovation, the usual way to refer to the Red Sea was to use the adjective *rubrus* (for *Mare Rubrum*, see the previous note).

legitur: *legere* is the *vox propria* to describe the action by which the divers searching for pearls "collect" the oysters from the seabed; cf. Prop. 1.14.12, *et legiturque Rubris gemma sub aequoribus*; [Tib.] 3.8.19–20, *et quascumque niger Rubro de litore gemmas / proximus Eois colligit Indus aquis*; Ov. *Ars* 3.124, *lectaque diverso litore concha venit*; Sen. *Her. O.* 662, *lapis Eoa lectus in unda*; Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.92, *quodque legit mersus pelagi scrutator Eoi.*

litore: *litus* here does not denote the land bordering on the sea, "the coast" (*margo aequarum*), in accordance with the traditional definition of the term (cf. Cels. *Dig.* 50.16.96 pr., *litus erat, quousque maximus fluctus a mari pervenit*; Donat. *Aen.* 3.135 p. 284.6, *ubi aqua maris finitur, litus dicitur*), but rather the part of the sea bordering on the land, "the inshore waters", a use first attested in Verg. *Ecl.* 2.25 and one not limited to poetry (cf. eg [Caes.] *Alex.* 13.5, *decem navibus missis una in cursu litore Aegyptio defecerat*); cf. also Hor. *Od.* 2.18.19–20, *marisque Bais obstrepentis urges summovere* ***litora*** (with Nisbet-Hubbard 303, supporting the thesis of E. Wistrand, *Nach Innen oder Nach Aussen?* [1946] 40); Verg. *Ge.* 1.359; *Aen.* 6.362; Sen. *Thy.* 371. On this use of *litus*, cf. also E. Wistrand, *op. cit.*, 37 ff.; E. Löfstedt, *Coniectanea* 1 (1950) 84 ff.; V. Skånland, *Symb. Osl.* 42 (1968) 93 ff.; *ThLL* 7.2.1537.52 ff.

concha: ie *margarita*. For this metonymic use of *concha* ("shell" = "pearl"), cf. Varro. *Men.* 382; Tib. 2.4.30; Prop. 1.8B.39; 3.13.6; Ov. *Am.* 2.11.13; *Ars* 3.124; *Met.* 10.260; Manil. 5.404; Gratt. 403; *ThLL* 4.28.41–47; *OLD concha* 2b; cf. also Mart. 5.37.3, (*puella*) *concha*

Lucrini delicatior stagni. The term *concha*—like *gemma*, *lapis*, *lapillus* or *baca*—offered the dactylic poet a greater possibility of adaptation to the metre than the impossible *mārgărĭtă* (trochee + trochee); observe in this connecton how the author of the epitaph to a *Margarita* in *AL* 1175.1–2 neatly gets round the problem: *Gallia me genuit, nomen mihi divitis undae / concha dedit, formae nominis aptus honos.*

18 tincta . . . Sidonio murice lana: for the formulation, cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.16.35–37, *Afro / murice tinctae / . . . lanae*; *Epod.* 12.21, *muricibus Tyriis iteratae vellera lanae*; Tib. 2.4.28, *et niveam Tyrio murice tingit ovem*, and Ov. *Ars* 3.170, *nec quae de Tyrio murice, lana, rubes*; cf. [Tib.] 3.8.15–16, *sola puellarum digna est, cui mollia caris / vellera det sucis bis madefacta Tyros.* The purple obtained from the secretions of marine molluscs (*murex*), depending on the origin and treatment, could present different shades of colouring, from bright red to violet and black (today some 140 different shades of purple are known). In the midst of all this variety, Tyre, a city on the Phoenician coast, was renowned in Antiquity for its purple dye (*dibapha*), one of the finest and most expensive of the time; according to Pliny, the purple from Tyre was like the colour of coagulated blood, which means it must have been quite dark, almost black: *nigricans aspectu idemque suspectu refulgens* (cf. *Nat.* 9.135; 137). There were other purple-producing centres all along the Mediterranean coast, such as the Greek cities of Asia Minor and Laconia (cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.18.8–9; Plin. *Nat.* 9.127; 21.45; 35.45; Paus. 3.21.6), the south of Italy (Puteoli, Tarentum) and Sicily, or Carthage in the north of Africa (cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.16.35–36, with Nisbet-Hubbard 269; *Ep.* 2.2.181; Tib. 2.3.58, *Africa puniceum purpureumque Tyros*, with Smith 427; Ov. *Fasti* 2.319, with Bömer 106; *RE* 2 A.609 [s.v. Girba]), but throughout Antiquity Tyre always maintained its supremacy. Because of its scarcity—and its prohibitive price (cf. Mart. 8.10; 14.156)—the manufacturing of substitutes for real purple was a thriving business in ancient times (cf. Thphr. *HP* 4.6.5; Plin. *Nat.* 22.3 ff.). Clothes dyed in purple (and often embroidered in gold) were a great symbol of wealth and power; purple was the colour of kings, emperors and triumphant generals (*toga picta*); a broad purple band on the tunic was the mark of a senator (*tunica laticlavia*), while two narrow bands denoted membership of the *ordo equester*.

On the production of purple dye in Antiquity, known centres of production and their peculiarities, and the history of the use of purple, which was regulated under the Roman Empire by sumptuary laws, see *RE* 23.2.2000–2020 (A. Druckenmüller); on the colour, see

H. Blümner, *Die Farbenbezeichnungen bei den römischen Dichtern* (Berlin: S. Calvary 1892) 184–198; André, *Termes de couleur*, pp. 90–102, 392–394; H. Gipper, "Purpur", *Glotta* 42 (1964) 39–69; on purple in general, cf. also Plin. *Nat.* 9.124 ff.; Pease 184–186 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 4.134; Mayor 98–100 *ad* Juv. 1.27; Kay 156 *ad* Mart. 11.40.11; Forbes, *Technology* 4, pp. 114 ff.; Marquardt-Mau 504 ff. For purple—especially from Tyre—used in Antiquity as a colour of luxury, a conspicuous symbol of wealth and power, cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.4.84; *Ep.* 1.6.17–18; Verg. *Ge.* 2.495, *purpura regum*; 3.25, *purpura intexti tollant aulaea Britanni*; *Aen.* 4.262–264 (the cloak dyed in Tyrian purple and embroidered in gold, a gift from Dido to Aeneas); 7.814–815, *regius ostro / velet honos levis umeros*; Tib. 1.2.75; 9.70; 2.3.58; 4.28; [Tib.] 3.8.15–16; Prop. 2.16.18; Ov. *Met.* 3.556, *purpuraque et pictis intextum vestibus aurum*; *Fasti* 5.27–28, (*Maiestas*) *consedit medio sublimis Olympo aurea purpureo conspicienda sinu*; Mart. 5.8; 23; 6.11; Curt. 9.7.12, *lineae vestes intexto auro purpuraque distinctae*; in particular, Ov. *Ars* 3.169–172; on this point, see M. Reinhold, *History of Purple as a Status Symbol in Antiquity* (*Collection Latomus* 116), Bruxelles 1970. In satire, scarlet-coloured clothing is a synonym, not only for luxury, but also for the carefree, dissolute and refined life of the dandy and the *bon vivant* (cf. Mart. 1.96.6–7; 2.57.2; 11.39.11 [with Kay 156]).

Sidonio murice: this combination seems not to be attested elsewhere, although there are occurrences of the adjective *Sidonius* applied to other terms for purple; cf. Hor. *Ep.* 1.10.26, *Sidonio . . . ostro* (= [Verg.] *Cir.* 387; Ov. *Tr.* 4.2.27; Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.225); Ov. *Met.* 10.267, *stratis concha Sidonide tinctis.*

Sidonio: in the strict sense, the adjective *Sidonius* denotes a person or thing from Sidon, a Phoenician coastal city. However, in a wider sense, it also denotes what comes from Tyre, and in an even more general sense it is applied to anything related to Phoenicia. Here, clearly related to purple, it is undoubtedly equivalent to "Tyrian". At times, the adjectives *Sidonius* and *Tyrius* in themselves even have the pregnant sense of "purple" and even "sumptuous" (eg Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.125; 3.2.140; 4.55, *Tyrios . . . amictus*; 4.4.76, *sinu Tyrio* [with Coleman 152–153]; Mart. 11.39.11, *Tyrios . . . cultus*; cf. André, *Termes de couleur*, p. 103). As for the prosody, the scansion of *Sidonius* varies: in Greek, the -o- can be short (as it is here), or long. In Virgil it is long in the formula *Sidonia Dido* (1.446; 613; 9.226; 11.74); however, it is short in 4.75, *Sidonias . . . opes* (with n. by Austin 46); 137, *Sidoniam picto chlamydem circumdata limbo*; the elegiac poets show

the same vacillation: long in Prop. 2.16.55, *Sidonia vestis*; Ov. *Ponto* 1.3.77; short elsewhere (eg Lygd. 3.18; Prop. 2.29.15; Ov. *Tr.* 4.3.2); Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, p. 54; likewise in Statius. The reason for the ambivalence lies in the demands of the metre.

murice: synecdoche (raw material-manufactured product relationship; cf. Lausberg, *Retórica Literaria*, p. 77 [§ 573.2]) for *purpura*; this poetic use is first attested in Verg. *Aen.* 4.262, *Tyrio . . . ardebat murice laena* (Donat. *Aen.* 9.580 p. 263.4, *purpura significata est murice*); cf. also Hor. *Od.* 2.16.36; *Epod.* 12.21; *Ep.* 2.2.181; Tib. 2.4.28; Ov. *Ars* 3.170; *Met.* 11.166, *Tyrio . . . murice*; *Fasti* 2.107; 319; Sen. *Phaed.* 388; Sil. 4.324; 14.658; 15.116; 16.569; Mart. 8.72.1; Luc. *Civ.* 3.217; Apul. Met. 10.20.2; *ThLL* 8.1671.5–30; *OLD murex* 3a. The *murex* is a univalve marine mollusc which secretes a liquid that the ancients used for dying, obtaining the colour purple. On the production of the purple dye, cf. Plin. *Nat.* 9.125–141.

lana: the rejection of purple-dyed cloth as a symbol of luxury goes back to B. *Fr.* 21.2, οὔτε πορφύρεοι τάπητες; cf. also Verg. *Ge.* 2.465, *alba nec Assyrio fucatur lana veneno*; Hor. *Od.* 2.18. 8–9, *nec Laconicas mihi trahunt honestae purpuras clientae* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 295–297). Regarded as particularly luxurious were those garments made with a fabric that was dyed in purple twice over (Plin. *Nat.* 9.135–137; 12.116; 21.45); cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.16.35–36; *Epod.* 12.21, *muricibus Tyriis* ***iteratae*** *vellera lanae*; Ov. *Fasti* 2.107, *Tyrio bis tinctam murice pallam*; Sen. *Her. O.* 663–664, *Sidonio mollis aeno / repetita bibit lana rubores*; Stat. *Silv.* 3.2.139–140a (with n. by Laguna 238–239); *Theb.* 9.690, *bis Oebalio saturatam murice pallam* (with n. by Dewar 168). For clothes as a luxury comparable to jewels and gold, cf. also Ov. *Am.* 1.10.61; 3.13.25–26; *Her.* 21.91–92; Sen. *Contr.* 2.5.7, *numquid gemmas et ex alieno litore petitos lapillos et aurum vestemque nihil in matrona tecturam concupivit?*; *ThLL* 2.1528.84 ff.; for the condemnation of costly silk clothes as an unnecessary luxury, cf. Prop. 1.2.2 (= 4.5.56).

19–20: for the content of this distich, cf. Arist. *Rh.* 1.5, ὅλως δὲ τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔστιν ἀπὸ τύχης, ἐφ' οἷς ἔστιν ὁ φθόνος; S. *OT* 380 ff., ὦ πλοῦτε καὶ τυραννὶ καὶ τέχνη τέχνης / ὑπερφέρουσα τῷ πολυζήλῳ βίῳ, / παρ' ὑμῖν ὁ φθόνος φυλάσσεται; Sall. *Cat.* 6.3, *sicuti pleraque mortalium habentur, invidia ex opulentia orta est*; Sen. *Dial.* 7 (*De vita beata*) 2.4, *quam magnus mirantium, tam magnus invidentium populus est. . . . ista quae spectantur, ad quae consistitur, quae alter alteri stupens monstrat, foris nitent, introrsus misera sunt.* The tone of the distich ties in with the Stoic polemic against the *falsae opiniones* of the common people, who were lacking

in critical sense and were over-credulous; cf. eg Sen. *Ep.* 94.58, *vis scire, quam falsus oculos tuos deceperat fulgor?*; 60, *non est quod invideas istis, quos magnos felicesque populus vocat*; 73; = *Dial.* 9 (*Tranqu.*) 10.5.

19 praeterea: Kroll 169 *ad* Catul. 64.184 and 273 *ad* 99.11 («Die Anknüpfung mit *praeterea* ist prosaich») stresses the word's unpoetic tone. Axelson (*Unpoetische Wörter*, p. 138 n. 8), in spite of the striking absence of the particle in Tib., Hor. *Lyr.*, Sen. *Trag.*, and Luc., yet holds out against considering it prosaic, given its substantial presence in the *Aeneid* (20 times). The explanation for the exception in Virgil is provided by A. Ernout: "*prăĕtĕrĕā*, il est d'un type prosodique trop commode pour qu'une poète dactylique renonce volontiers à s'en passer" ("Unpoetische Wörter", *RPh* 21 [1947] 59 n. 3).

populus miratur: cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.15.35, *vilia miretur vulgus.*

miratur: for *mirari* in the sense of "to admire with veneration or adoration", cf. Cic. *Off.* 1.71, *despicere . . . ea, quae plerique mirentur, imperia et magistratus*; likewise *inhiant*, "gape", in Verg. *Ge.* 2.463 (in a similar context of wealth that arouses admiration and envy).

20 falso: "falsely". This adverb—in both its senses: "erroneously, baselessly" (*OLD falso* 1) and "intending to deceive" (*OLD falso* 2)—rarely appears in poetry; cf. Enn. *Sat.* 8, *falso criminat*; Naev. *Pall.* 3, *dicitur geminum alterum falso occidisse*; Ter. *Hec.* 777, *mulieres suspectas fuisse falso . . . invenimus*; Catul. 114.1, *Firmano saltu non falso Mentula dives / fertur*; [Sen.] *Oct.* 274; *ThLL* 6.1.199.13–200.4. Nevertheless, Ovid uses this adverb no less than eight times (cf. *Am.* 3.12.43; *Her.* 7.35, *fallor et ista mihi falso iactatur imago*; 17 [*Helene Paridi*] 150–151, *in nostris oculos vultibus esse reor. / Nec reor hoc falso . . .*; 20 [*Acontius Cydippae*] 197, *promittes votum; scit te promittere falso*; *Met.* 11.662, *falso tibi me promittere noli!*; *Tr.* 5.13.18; *Fasti* 5.683, *si . . . falso . . . citavi . . . numina . . . Iovis*). This rare poetic use must be viewed within the general tendency among the Latin poets to avoid adverbs in favour of the adjective, either predicatively or as an attribute of an *ad hoc* noun (eg *crudeli manu* instead of *crudeliter*); cf. Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, pp. 62–63 (for *falso*, *ib.*, p. 63). For the sense of *falso* here ("without reason", "with no basis"), cf. Ov. *Her.* 7.35 and 17.151 (cited above); in prose Sall. *Iug.* 1.1, *falso queritur de natura sua genus humanum, quod imbecilla atque aevi brevis forte potius quam virtute regatur.*

21: topos of *divitiae operosae*, a commonplace in popular philosophy and widely echoed in the work of Horace, which must have provided Lygdamus with inspiration; cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.16.9 –12, *non enim gazae neque consularis / submovet lictor miseros tumultus / mentis et curas laqueata*

circum / tecta volantes; 3.1.37 ff.; *Ep.* 1.2.47 ff.; cf. also Varro *Men.* 36, *non fit thensauris, non auro pectu' solutum; / non demunt animis curas ac religiones / Persarum montes, non atria divitis Crassi* (with Cèbe 2.155–162).

levantur: used zeugmatically here for *mentes* in the sense of "to free" (cf. Lucr. 2.365, *animum curaque levare*; *OLD levo* 6), for *curae* in the sense of "relieve" (cf. Catul. 2.10, *tristis animi levare curas*; *OLD levo* 5a). There is a similar zeugma in Ov. *Met.* 10.368, *curasque et corpora somnus / solverat* (cf. also Tib. 1.4.65–66). On zeugma in general in Latin poetry, see A. J. Bell, *The Latin dual and poetic diction* (1923) 304–314; Kenney 160 *ad* Lucr. 3.614; R. J. Getty, *M. Annaei Lucani De Bello Civili I* (1955) lxii–lxiii; Hofmann-Szantyr 831–834 (§ 56). It might be reasonable to suspect *non opibus mentes hominum curis relevantur.* For the use of *relevare* in the sense of *cura liberare, recreare, consolari,* cf. Cic. *Att.* 3.10.3, *haec eo scripsi ut potius relevares me, quod facis, quam aut castigatione aut obiurgatione dignum putares*; Prop. 1.14.22, *quid relevant* (scil. *curis Veneris*) *variis serica textilibus?* (with Fedeli 333); Ov. *Tr.* 1.11.12, *omnis ab hac cura mens relevata mea est.*

22: popular topos of the continual and capricious vicissitudes of ever-changing fortune in human affairs; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 9.5, *fors omnia versat*); Ov. *Tr.* 1.5.25–38; 3.7.41–42; Sen. *Dial.* 11 (*Consolatio ad Polybium*) 10.4, *rerum natura illum non mancipio dedit, sed commodavit; cum visum est deinde repetit nec tuam in eo satietatem secuta est sed suam legem*; *Phaed.* 978–980, *res humanas ordine nullo / Fortuna regit sparsitque manu / munera caeca*; Manil. 1.56, *in quas Fortunae leges quaeque hora valeret*; Juv. 10.72–74; G. B. A. Fletcher, "Latin *Marginalia*", *CQ* 25 (1931) 50; traces in proverbs in Otto, *Sprichwörter*, pp. 142–143 s.v. *Fortuna* 5 [698]. Recall also the motif of *Fortunae rota*; cf. Pi. *O.* 2.21–22, ὅταν θεοῦ Μοῖρα τέμπῃ / ἀνεκὰς ὄλβον ὑψηλόν; Soph. *Fr.* 575; 871 Pearson; Cic. *Pis.* 22, *Fortunae rotam pertimescebat*; Hor. *Od.* 1.34.14–16; 3.10.10; Tib. 1.5.70, *versatur celeri Fors levis orbe rotae* (with Smith 306–307); Prop. 2.8.8; Ov. *Tr.* 5.8.7–8, *nec metuis dubio Fortunae stantis in orbe / numen?*; *Ponto* 2.3.56; 4.3.31–32; [Albinov.] *Liv.* 52; Sen. *Ag.* 71–72 (*pace* Tarrant 186–187); Tac. *Dial.* 23; Aus. *Par.* 22.13, *aut iam Fortunae sic se vertigo rotabat*; Amm. 14.11.26; 26.8.13, *quod quivis beatus versa rota Fortunae ante vesperum potest esse miserrimus*; 31.1.1, *interea et Fortunae volucris rota, adversa prosperis semper alternans*; Claud. *Bell. Goth.* 632 ff. (*Nemesis*); Boeth. *Cons.* 2.1; 2.2.29; *OLD rota* 3d; cf. also Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 142 s.v. *Fortuna* 2 [695]; D. M. Robinson, "The Wheel of Fortune", *CPh* 41 (1946) 207–216. The usual epithets for Fortune often stress her fickleness: *varia* (cf. Sen. *Med.* 287), *volubilis* (cf. Ov. *Tr.* 5.8.15), *fallax* (cf. Sen.

Ag. 58), *levis* (cf. Ov. *Ponto* 4.3.31; Publ.-Syr. *Sent.* 295, *levis est Fortuna: cito reposcit, quod dedit*; Sen. *Herc. O.* 452). On the goddess Fortune, see the hymn which Horace dedicates to her in *Od.* 1.35 (with Nisbet-Hubbard 386–388).

nam: on this particle, see the commentary on l. 11.

regit: although the bulk of the mss. offer the reading *gerit* (for *gerere* = *dirigere*, *gubernare*, cf. Publ.-Syr. *Sent.* 320, *male geritur, quidquid geritur Fortunae fide*; Ov. *Met.* 11.489, *quae dum sine lege geruntur, aspera crescit hiems*; *ThLL* 6.2.1940.63–73) modern editors since Vulpius have chosen to read *regit* with the *codex Guelferbytanus* and the *Florilegium Gallicum*, in accordance with the strikingly predominant use of this verb to describe the action of the divine, supernatural or impersonal forces that direct the destinies of humankind; cf. Sall. *Iug.* 102.9, *humanarum rerum Fortuna pleraque regit*; [Sall.] *Rep.* 2.1.2, *saepe prava magis quam bona consilia prospere eveniunt: quia plerasque res Fortuna ex lubidine sua agitat*; Liv. 28.30.11, *fortuna regente*; Juv. 9.32, *Fata regunt homines*; Manil. 4.14, *Fata regunt orbem*; Sen. *Phaed.* 978–980, *res humanas ordine nullo / Fortuna regit sparsitque manu munera caeca*; cf. *OLD rego* 7c.

sua . . . lege: this capricious *lex* of Fortune stands in contrast to the firm and inexorable *lex* of fate; cf. Manil. 4.14, *Fata regunt orbem, certa stant omnia lege.* On the *lex fatalis*, cf. Lygd. 4.47, *fatorum leges* (comm.).

tempora: "vicissitudes, ups and downs (of Fortune)". For the *tempora Fortunae*, cf. Ov. *Met.* 15.420–422, *sic* ***tempora*** *verti / cernimus atque illas adsumere robora gentes, / concidere has.*

23–24: climax of the development of the theme of *operosae divitiae* of the preceding lines (11–22). Here, however, the path of popular pholosophy is abandoned to enter the terrain of Tibullan elegy proper: the long diatribe against the worries brought by wealth does not lead to the logical conclusion, *secura paupertas*, but in *paupertas tecum*, poverty in the company of the beloved; that is to say, one set of worries is replaced by another, so that we again move further away from the ataraxia of the wise (cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.16). The truth is that the reasoning is somewhat faulty, for at no point is it explained why wealth and the loved one are incompatible. At bottom, the scorning of wealth and preference for a poor life together with the beloved is simply an emphatic testimony of love. On the elegiac ideal of *paupertas*, see the commentary on the term in the following note. For the rejection of *divitiae sine amore*, cf. Tib. 1.1 *passim*; 2.75–76, *quid Tyrio recubare toro sine amore secundo / prodest cum fletu nox vigilanda venit?*; 8.33–34, *huic* (= *iuveni*) *tu candentes umero subpone lacertos, / et regum magnae*

despiciantur opes (with Smith 350; the pentameter by Tibullus might well have exercised some influence on Lygdamus' pentameter); Prop. 1.14.15–16, *nam quis divitis adverso gaudet Amore? / nulla mihi tristi praemia sint Venere!*, and 23–24, *quae* (scil. *Venus*) *mihi dum placata aderit, non ulla verebor / regna vel Alcinoi munera despicere*); cf. also the commentary on ll. 3–10. This elegiac motif "alii operosas divitias cupiant, licet pauper amatam gaudeat" can be detected as early as Pl. *Curc.* 178–180, *sibi sua habeant regna reges, sibi divitias divites, / sibi honores, sibi virtutes, sibi pugnas, sibi proelia, / dum mihi abstineat invidere, sibi quisque habeat, quod suum est.* For the idea that "the lover is a king" or "love is worth more than (regal) wealth", cf. Sapph. 16.17–20 L.-P.; Call. *Fr.* 75.43–47; Aristaenet. 1.10; Theoc. 8.53; Catul. 45.21–22; Hor. *Od.* 2.12.21–28 (with Nisbet-Hubbard 197 *ad* v. 21); 3.9.1, *donec gratus eram tibi / nec quisquam potior bracchia candidae / cervici iuvenis dabat, / Persarum vigui rege beatior*; Tib. 1.8.33–34 *sup. cit.*; 2.2.10–16, *roga. / Auguror, uxoris fidos optabis amores. /.../ Nec tibi malueris, totum quaecumque per orbem / fortis arat valido rusticus arva bove, / nec tibi, gemmarum quicquid felicibus Indis / nascitur, Eoi qua maris unda rubet*; Prop. 1.8.33–36, *illa vel angusto mecum requiescere lecto / et quocumque modo maluit esse mea, / quam sibi dotatae regnum vetus Hippodamiae / et quas Elis opes apta pararat equis.*

23 paupertas: the term *paupertas* (or *pauperies*) suggests at times, as it does here, modest living conditions—the lack of well-being, luxury and opulence rather than real poverty (*inopia*) or absolute need and destitution (*egestas*)—and carries with it moral connotations; cf. Ar. *Pl.* 552 ff.; Liv. *Praef.* 11; Sen. *Ep.* 87.40, *non video quid alius sit paupertas quam parvi possessio* (for the *paupertas* of the *avari*, cf. 2.6; 119.12); *Dial.* 9 (*De tranqu.*) 8.4, *tu istud paupertatem, inopiam, egestatem voca* (marking well the increasing intensity of the terms); Mart. 11.32.8, *non est paupertas, Nestor, habere nihil*; Varro *ap.* Non. 43M (p. 60 Müller); Porph. *Ep.* 2.2.199, *paupertas etiam honestae parsimoniae nomen est, et usurpatur in fortuna mediocri*; Serv. *Ge.* 1.146, *peior est egestas quam paupertas; paupertas enim honesta esse potest.* A poet was conventionally "poor", whether he was a client, a lover or a moralist; the motif appears with the Alexandrians and then becomes very frequent, especially in elegy; cf. *AP* 5.30 (Antip. Thess.); 32 (Marc. Arg.); 50 (Anon.); 6.302 (Leon.); 12.90 (Anon.); 148 (Call.); 212 (Straton); Call. *Fr.* 193.17 (= *Iambi* 3.17); Theoc. 16; Hor. *Od.* 2.18.10 (with Nisbet-Hubbard 299); *Epod.* 11.11–12; Tib. 1.1.5–6, *me mea paupertas vita traducat inerti, / dum meus adsiduo luceat igne focus* (with Murgatroyd 53; for what Tibullus, an *eques Romanus*, understands by *paupertas*, cf. 1.1.77–78); 5.61–66; 2.4.21–

22; Prop. 1.8.39–40; Ov. *Am.* 1.3.9–10; *Tr.* 4.10.22, *Maeonides nullas ipse reliquit opes*; Petr. *Satyr.* 83.9, *amor ingenii neminem umquam divitem fecit*; Juv. 7.8 ff.; *AP* 9.169 ff. (Palladas); W. Stroh, *Die römische Liebeselegie als werbende Dichtung* (Hildesheim 1968) 214–215.

24 sine te: the formulation recalls the ritual ἄνευ σέθεν of entreaties and hymns, as in Catul. 61.61, *nil potest sine te Venus* (with Kroll 112); Lucr. 1.22, *nec sine te quisquam*; Nisbet-Hubbard 307 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 1.26.9 (cf. Williams, *Trad. & Orig.*, p. 200 *ad loc.*); Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, pp. 157–158 and 350. Virgil makes a similar dignificatory use of this formula, bordering on deification, in *Ge.* 3.42, *te sine* (scil. *Maecenate*) *nil altum mens incohat* (with Mynors 187).

regum munera: a vague expression that may refer to the *Alcinoi munera* of Prop. 1.14.24, a passage which in turn alludes either to the palace of Alcinous, a gift from the gods to the king of the Phaeaces, famous for his many luxuries and comforts, as well as an extraordinary orchard where all kinds of fruit grew in abundance as if it were the last redoubt of the much yearned-for *Aetas Aurea* (cf. Hom. *Od.* 7.81–132), or else to the splendid gifts the hospitable Alcinous bestowed upon Ulysses, to whom he even offered his own daughter, Nausicaa, in marriage (cf. Hom. *Od.* 8.388 ff.). On Alcinous as a paradigm of wealth and generosity, see Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 12 s.v. *Alcinous* 1 [53]. Behind this expression of Lygdamus may well be Tib. 1.8.34, *et regum magnae despiciantur opes.*

volo: Huschke defends the reading *volo* (as against *velim*, which is preferred by Voss), citing Nep. 15 (*Epam.*) 4.2, *namque orbis terrarum divitias accipere nolo pro patriae caritate.*

25–26: it is now that we in fact discover the real immediate objective of Lygdamus' entreaty: the return of Neaera to his side, a *sine qua non* if he is to realize the golden dream of ll. 7–10, to grow old in the company of his beloved. The revelation of this intimate desire of the poet is highlighted by the sudden change from the straightforward statement style of the language to an expressive-impressive mode: Lygdamus' long moral-philosophical reasoning is interrupted by an uncontrollable torrent of unadulterated personal experience.

As regards the formulation, it consists of a series of accusatives of interjection reinforced by *o!*, as is the general norm from the classical period on; cf. Kühner-Stegmann II.1.272; Hofmann-Szantyr 48 (§ 49 b ß); Ernout-Thomas 19; Bassols I.56–57 (§ 43).

o: here, as usual, an interjection expressing strong emotion. It is "an interjection of joyful or pained surprise, of desire, of intense pathos,

and in general a vivid manifestation of affection" (cf. Hofmann, *Latin familiar*, p. 27 [§ 23]).

25 niveam . . . lucem: "snow-white day". It is a topos to conceive of happy days as bright, shining and springlike, while days of sadness are seen as black, dark and autumnal. There was also a custom, frequently mentioned by Greek and Roman authors, of keeping a tally of the happy days (in poetry, the nights too) by means of white stones placed in an urn (in poetry, pearls and precious stones are sometimes used), while unhappy days are counted with black stones; cf. Catul. 68B.147–148, *quare illud satis est, si nobis is datur unis / quem lapide illa diem candidiore notat*; Pers. 2.1, *hunc, Macrine, diem* (scil. *Natalem*) *numera meliore lapillo* (with Jahn 119, Harvey 54, Kissel 293; cf. also Schol. Pers. 2.1); Plin. *Ep.* 6.11.3, *o diem . . . laetum notandumque mihi candidissimo calculo!*; Mart. 8.45.2; 9.52.4–5, *felix utraque lux diesque nobis / signandi melioribus lapillis!*; 10.38.4–5, *o nox omnis et hora, quae notata est / caris litoris Indici lapillis*; 11.36.1–2, *Gaius hanc lucem gemma mihi Iulius alba / signat* (with Kay 149); 12.34.5–7; Stat. *Silv.* 4.6.18, *nox et Erythraeae Thetidis signanda lapillis* (with Coleman 180); Sidon. *Carm.* 14.3. According to Plin. *Nat.* 7.131 it is an ancient Thracian custom (cf. Otto, *Sprichwörter*, pp. 64 ff. [299]). Phylarchus *ap.* Zenobius Paroem. 6.13 (*FGH* 81 F 83) and Suid. s.v. λευκὴ ἡμέρα, on the other hand, regard this procedure as Scythian in origin. Kissel (293 n. 2 *ad* Pers. 2.1) informs of another custom, falsely attributed to Cretan origin—through connecting *creta* with *Creta* (cf. Isid. *Orig.* 16.1.6, *creta ab insula Creta ubi melior est*)—and frequently confused with the previous one by the commentators, including the ancients (eg Porph. *Od.* 1.36.10), which lay in marking in chalk on a calendar the happy days in the life of a man (cf. Catul. 107.6, *o lucem candidiore nota!* [with Fordyce 395]; Hor. *Od.* 1.36.10, *Cressa ne careat pulchra dies nota* [with Nisbet-Hubbard 403]; Stat. *Silv.* 4.8.40, *creta signare diem*). The same symbolic distribution of colours is found in the ancient custom of using small black stones to condemn the accused and white to acquit them (cf. Ov. *Met.* 15.41–42; Sidon. *Ep.* 4.6.3; Plin. *Ep.* 1.2.5; Symm. 1.96). As regards the formulation of this hexameter, the closest passage is undoubtedly Catul. 107.6 (*sup. cit.*), also in a context of the return of the beloved to the poet's side.

niveam: a novel variation on the usual *candidus* (for the figurative sense equivalent to *laetus, prosperus, felix*, cf. *ThLL* 3.244.28–43; *OLD candidus* 1c and 7a) in this sort of context in poetry; cf. Catul. 8.3, *fulsere quondam candidi tibi soles* (with Fordyce 111), and 8, *fulsere vere*

candidi tibi soles; Tib. 1.7.63–64, *at tu, Natalis* (scil. *dies*) *multos celebrande per annos, / candidior semper candidiorque veni*; Prop. 2.15.1, *o me felicem! o nox mihi candida!*; Ov. *Her.* 15.124, *somnia formoso candidiora die*; 16.320, *candidior medio nox erit illa die*; *Tr.* 3.4.34, *fato candidiore frui* (with Luck 188); 5.5.13–14, *optime natalis! quamvis procul absumus, opto / candidus huc venias*; *Ponto* 2.4.30, *non ita pars fati candida nulla mei est* (with Pérez Vega 173); 4.4.18, *candidus et felix proximus annus erit*; Pers. 2.1–2, *diem . . ., qui tibi . . . apponit candidus annos* (with Jahn 119; Harvey 57; Kissel 294); Sen. *Med.* 329, *candida nostri saecula parentes videre*; Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.71 (with Laguna 155); 4.3.146; Petr. *Satyr.* 127.9, *candidior . . . dies* (in a fragment of verse); cf. also the commentary on Lygd. 6.8, *fulserit hic niveis Delius alitibus*; 30, *sis felix et sint candida fata tua*; the origin of this figurative sense goes back to proverbial expressions such as in Ov. *Tr.* 2.142, *nube solet pulsa candidus ire dies* ("after cloudy days come sunny"); cf. also *albus dies* in Sil. 15.53; *i.a.* In the same way the Greeks used the metaphor λευκὸν ἦμαρ (eg A. *Pers.* 301) or λευκὴ ἡμέρα (eg Men. *Fr.* 315 Koch = 260 Körte). Considered particularly happy was the *dies Natalis* (cf. Tib. 1.7.63–64; Ov. *Tr.* 5.5.13–14 cited above), the day when the sick person recovered from a serious illness (cf. Prop. 2.28.59–60; Stat. *Silv.* 1.4.1–2; Mart. 11.36.1) or a traveller returned safe and sound from a long and perilous journey (cf. Catul. 9.11; Hor. *Od.* 1.36.10; Juv. 12.1). On the other hand, sad days were black, especially the day of death; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.429, *abstulit atra dies* (= 11.28); Prop. 2.24.34, *me non aetas . . . non niger ille dies*; Lygd. 5.5, *mihi Persephone nigram denuntiat horam.* On the proverbial opposition of black and white, cf. [Verg.] *Dir.* 99, *prius . . . candida nigra oculi cernent*; Ov. *Met.* 11.314, *candida de nigris facere et de candentibus atra . . . facere*; Juv. 3.30, *cedamus patria . . . maneant qui nigrum in candida vertunt*; cf. Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 243 s.v. *niger* [1225].

lucem: the metonymic use of *lux* for *dies* is fairly frequent in the whole of Latin literature, in all the senses of *dies*, both to denote the time during which the sun gives its light, as opposed to night (cf. Lucr. 5.681; Liv. 5.42.6; Ov. *Met.* 7.662, *lucis pars optima mensae est data, nox somnis*; cf. *OLD lux* 4a), and also to denote the calendar day, the sum of day and night (cf. Cic. *Mil.* 98, *centesima lux est haec ab interitu*; [Caes.] *Hisp.* 10.1, *insequenti luce Arguetius . . . venit*; Paneg. Mess. 160, *hibernas . . . luces*; Ov. *Met.* 4.262, *per . . . novem luces expers . . . cibi*; 14.227, *lucibus isse novem*; *Ponto* 2.1.25, *multis lucibus ante*; cf. *OLD lux* 5), and in particular to indicate the important day or date when something happens or is done (cf. Acc. *Trag.* 37, *scibam hanc mihi*

supremam lucem . . . dari; Catul. 64.31, *optatae . . . luces* (ie *dies nuptialis*); 107.6, *o lucem candidiore nota!*; Hor. *Od.* 4.6.42, *festas . . . luces*; 15.25, *profestis lucibus et sacris*; Tib. 2.1.5, *luce sacra* [with Murgatroyd 24] y 29, *festa luce*; Ov. *Met.* 9.760, *luxque iugalis*; 15.868 and 873, *ille dies* [ie *dies fatalis*]; *Tr.* 1.1.97, *luce bona* [= *Ponto* 3.1.159]; *Fasti* 1.71, *prospera lux*; *Ponto* 4.9.15, *illa . . . luce* [= *iusso . . . die*, v. 8]; Stat. *Ach.* 1.287; Pers. 6.69; Mart. 9.52.4–5, *felix utraque lux diesque nobis / signandi melioribus lapillis!*); in the Augustan period and earlier *lux* = *dies* occurs only seldom in prose (cf. *ThLL* 7.2.1911.26 ff.).

poterit: "might be able to". The use of the future instead of the subjunctive accentuates the assertive character of the phrase. The future comes close to having a modal force in assertive formulas of the type *dabunt di quae velitis vobis* (Pl. *As.* 623), *ita* (or *sic*) *me di amabunt!* (Pl. and Ter.), but unlike the optative subjunctive it adds a note of certainty; cf. Hofmann-Szantyr 310 (§ 174 γ)].

reddere: this is the key word in the elegy, picked up again by means of false etymology in ll. 27 (*reditu* < red-eo) and 35 (*reditum* < red-eo), and the concept which generates the whole of the Lygdamus cycle: in this gift-book Lygdamus aims to move Neaera's heart so that she will return to him, a return the poet pictures as a return/giving back, since he describes his rival as *raptor* (cf. 2.2, *eripuit*; 4, *erepta coniuge*); cf. Pichon, p. 251 s.v. *reddere*, "reddere est . . . raptam restituere".

o mihi: a line-beginning of great pathos, already in Verg. 3.489, *o mihi sola mei super Astyanactis imago*; later a favourite expression of Ovid, especiallly in his works in exile, in which the characteristic self-pitying tone is marked from the very beginning; cf. Ov. *Met.* 12.586, *o mihi de fratris longe gratissime natis* (with Bömer 186); *Tr.* 1.3.66, *o mihi Thesea pectora iuncta fide*; 5.1, *o mihi post ullos nunquam memorande sodales*; 3.4.1, *o mihi care quidem semper*; 4.5.1, *o mihi dilectos inter pars prima sodales*; *Ponto* 4.6.22, *o mihi non dubia cognite Brute nota*; 13.1, *o mihi non dubios inter memorande sodales*; the *Thesaurus* (9.2.11.7 ff.) mentions no *locus* in prose.

26 mihi: dative complement of an adjective (*felicem*); cf. Kühner-Stegmann II.1.314 ff.; Hofmann-Szantyr 91–92 (§ 65); Ernout-Thomas 64–65 (§ 79); Bassols I.114–115 (§ 104); for the combination of *felix* with a 'dativus commodi', cf. Liv. 3.7.5, *fidesque sua sociis parum felix*; Mart. 1.101.2, *felix domino*; *ThLL* 6.1.450.12 ff.

felicem terque quaterque: "thrice and a hundred times blessed". Behind this expression lies, in an altered and vulgarized form, the

traditional formula of praise of the fortunate man, the μακαρισμός, the oldest model for which dates back to Hom. *Od.* 5.306–307, τρισμάκαρες Δαναοὶ καὶ τετράκις οἳ τότ' ὄλοντο / Τροίῃ ἐν εὐρείῃ; 6.154–159. Though epic in origin, this expression is by no means exclusively restricted to this genre; cf. Emp. 68B 132 Diels-Kranz, ὄλβιος ὃς θείων πραπίδων ἐκτήσατο πλοῦτον; E. *Fr.* 902N², ὄλβιος ὅστις τῆς ἱστορίας /ἔσχε μάθησιν . . .; Ar. *Pax* 1333; *Pl.* 850–852, οἴμοι κακοδαίμων, ὡς ἀπόλωλα δείλαιος, /καὶ τρισκακοδαίμων καὶ τετράκις καὶ πεντάκις /καὶ δωδεκάκις καὶ μυριάκις; *AP* 5.195.5; 12.52.3–4 (Mel.). The adjectives generally used are μάκαρ, μακάριος, ὄλβιος, εὐδαίμων (ὅς), *felix*, *beatus*, *fortunatus* (*qui*), and as a poetic formula advocating happiness it is attested in application to the most varied situations and motifs (love, wealth, military and sporting glory, marriage, etc.), and also in the language of the mystery cults. Among Latin authors the formula is found in Hor. *Od.* 1.13.17–20, *felices ter et amplius / quos irrupta tenet copula nec malis / divolsus querimoniis / suprema citius solvet amor die* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 177); *Epod.* 2.1, *beatus ille qui procul negotiis/ . . .*; Verg. *Ge.* 2.458–459, *o fortunatos nimium, sua si bona norint, / agricolas!*; 490–492, *felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas/ . . .* (with Mynors 169); 493–494, *fortunatus et ille deos qui novit agrestis/ . . .*; *Aen.* 1.94–96, *o terque quaterque beati, / quis . . ./ contigit oppetere!*; [Verg.] *Cir.* 28, *felix qui talem annum videre diemque*; Tib. 1.10.63–64, *quater ille beatus, / qui tenera irato flere puella potest*; Prop. 1.12.15, *felix qui potuit praesenti flere puellae*; 2.34.71, *felix, qui viles pomis mercaris amores!*; 3.12.15, *ter quater in casta felix, o Postume, Galla!* (cf. Fedeli *Prop.* I 296; III 403); Ov. *Am.* 2.11.30, *felix . . . quem sua terra tenet!*; *Her.* 17.147, *felices, quibus usus adest!*; *Ars* 2.447–448, *o quater et quotiens comprendere non est / felicem, de quo falsa puella dolet*; *Met.* 4.320–326; 8.51; 10.329, *felices, quibus ista licent*; *Fasti* 1.297–298, *felices animae, quibus haec cognoscere primis / inque domus superas scandere cura fuit!*; *Tr.* 3.12.25–26; Sil. 9.159–160; Stat. *Theb.* 10.615; Apul. *Met.* 11.16, *felix . . . et ter beatus, qui . . .*; Prud. *Perist.* 2.529–530, *o ter quaterque et septies / beatus*; Rutil.-Nam. 1.5.8, *o quantum et quotiens possum numerare beatos / nasci felici qui meruere solo, / qui Romanorum procerum generosa propago / ingentium cumulant Vrbis honore decus!* It is even possible to detect some examples in prose; cf. eg Sen. *Ep.* 11.9, *o felicem illum qui non praesens tantum sed etiam cogitatus emendat! o felicem qui sic aliquem vereri potest ut ad memoriam quoque eius se componat atque ordinet!* An example of a similar vulgarization of this formula, removed from its original context of *makarismós*, is Ov. *Ponto* 4.9.34, *ter quater imperii laetus honore tui.* There is a further Lygdamean

makarismós in Lygd. 6.43b–44, *felix, quicumque dolore / alterius disces posse cavere tuum* (comm.).

On *makarismós* and its topoi, cf. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, p. 100; G. Lejeune Dirichlet, *De veterum macarismis*, *RVV* 14.4 (Giessen 1914); B. Snell, "Φαίνεταί μοι κῆνος", *Hermes* 66 (1931) 74 ff.; B. Gladigow, "Zum Makarismos des Weisen", *Hermes* 95 (1967) 404–433; P. Fedeli, *Catullus' Carmen 61* (Amsterdam 1983) 78–79.

terque quaterque: The adverbial periphrasis *terque quaterque* (and similar) serves to express emphatically the repetition of a verbal action an indeterminate number of times (cf. eg Verg. *Ge.* 2.399; *Aen.*, 4.589; Ov. *Met.* 1.179; 2.49; Luc. *Civ.* 5.497); when applied to an adjective, it intensifies hyperbolically the quality of the adjective; cf. Hofmann-Szantyr 211 (§ 113 a). For the reduplication of *-que*, which is undoubtedly epic in tone, see Lygd. 1.4 *perque . . . perque* (comm.).

felicem . . . diem: the same expression appears in Ter. *And.* 956, *o faustum et felicem diem*; Verg. *Ge.* 1.276, *dies . . . felices operum*; [Verg.] *Cir.* 27, *felix illa dies* (with Lyne 113); *Aetna* 636; Manil. 5.568; Vell. 2.10.7; Sen. *Tro.* 470; *Laus. Pis.* 159; *ThLL* 5.1.1056.33–39; as a formula to express happiness, cf. also Plin. *Ep.* 6.11.1–3, *o diem laetum!* (= Stat. *Silv.* 4.7.31).

diem: used here in its sense of "special day or date" (cf. *OLD* *dies* 6); for the gender and meanings of *dies*, cf. Lygd. 6.32 (comm.).

27–32: Lygdamus now picks up again the initial theme of this elegy, prayer to the gods (*voventur* = *votis*, l. 1), though he now focuses on the real content of his entreaty: the return of Neaera (*pro dulci reditu*, l. 27). And once again he resumes the *divitiae/amor* diatribe, but whereas before (ll. 1–24) the diatribe stemmed from the content of his prayer—"I ask not for wealth, but love"—it is now related to the result of his entreaty: "if the gods do not grant me love, I desire not wealth". As regards the formulation, Lygdamus uses the priamel for the third time: *alii-opes* (ll. 29–31a) / *mihi-secura paupertas* (ll. 31b–32).

at si: this phrase is used "when the presumption on which we have been acting hitherto is withdrawn, and to suit the new conditions fresh instructions have to be issued" (Mynors 15 *ad* Verg. *Ge.* 1.67).

pro dulci reditu quaecumque voventur: for the formulation, cf. Hor. *Epod.* 16.35–36, *haec et quae poterunt reditus abscindere dulcis . . . execrata.* Lygdamus here seems to be parodying the formula *votum pro reditu* corresponding both to the προπεμπτικόν, or prayer for the safe return of one who has set out on a long and dangerous journey (cf.

Ov. *Tr.* 1.1; J. N. Rauk, *The lover's farewell: a study of the propemptikon in Greek and Latin literature*, Ph.D. Diss., Michigan University 1987; P. Fedeli, *Properzio. Il Primo Libro delle Elegie*, Firenze 1980, pp. 203–207; F. Jäger, *Das Antike Propemptikon und das 17. Gedicht des Paulinus von Nola*, Diss., München 1913, pp. 4–36; Nisbet-Hubbard, *Hor.* I, pp. 40–45), and to the σωτηρία, or prayer for the rapid recovery of one convalescing after a serious illness (cf. Catul. 44; Hor. *Od.* 2.17; [Tib.] 4.4[= 3.10]; Prop. 2.28B and C; Ov. *Am.* 2.13; Stat. *Silv.* 1.4; Mart. 11.36 [*votis redditus*, l. 2]; Cairns, *Generic Composition*, pp. 73–74). In fact, the term *red(d)itus* ("return/giving back") lends itself to such ambiguity, as it compares someone's "return/being returned" from a perilous journey or from the claws of death with the "return/giving back" of the stolen Neaera; it should also be borne in mind that *reditus* in addition denotes "reconciliation" (cf. Cic. *Att.* 2.3, *reditus in gratiam cum aliquo*), which is Lygdamus' objective. Considering Neaera's return (ll. 25–26) as a "bright and happy day" strengthens this impression, as it also forms part of these two motifs. Moreover, it is reasonable to consider the possibility that what we have here is a genuine example of *propemptikón* or, more accurately, *soteria*; only if we consider the elegy as part of the cycle as a whole does *reditum* take on its complete significance in relation to the *discidium*.

28: in Roman literature there is frequent use of the image of the ears to refer to the interlocutor's listening favourably or unfavourably to a plea (cf. Pl. *Men.* 4, *ut benignis accipiatis auribus*; Cic. *Fam.* 7.33.2, *meis aequissimis utuntur auribus*; Liv. 24.26.10, *aversibus auribus animisque*; 38.33.11, *cum aversis auribus pauca locuti essent, damnati omnes et traditi sunt ad supplicium*; 42.28.2, *non secundis auribus*; Sen. *Suas.* 1.12, *propitiis auribus accipitur*) or even to indicate any other attitude or frame of mind with which the interlocutor receives a given oral message; cf. Stat. *Theb.* 10.771, *attonitis* . . . *auribus*; Cato *Or.* 182, *aures nobis calliscerunt ad iniurias*; Caes. *Civ.* 2.27.2, *auribus Vari* (scil. *victi*) *serviunt*; Mart. 4.82.4, *non tetrica nugas exigat aure meas.* This personalization, as here, also stretches to the ears, well-disposed or hostile to entreaties, of the gods themselves. As for the formulation, this pentameter is the reverse of Prop. 1.1.31, *quibus facili deus annuit aure*; on the other hand, it is close to Hor. *Epod.* 10.18, *preces* . . . *et aversum ad Iovem.*

aversa . . . aure: although a significant group of mss. give *adversa*, most editors prefer to follow the reading *aversa*, which is the 'lectio difficilior'. Confusion between these two words is constant in the history of manuscript tradition; cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.23.19, *aversos Penatis*; Verg.

Aen. 1.482, *diva solo fixos oculos aversa tenebat*; Prop. 4.1.73, *aversus* (*adversus* l. 1) *Apollo*; Ov. *Her.* 7.4, *averso* (Heinsius: *adverso* ... *deo* codd.) ... *deo*; *Tr.* 1.3.45 *aversos* (Luck 41 : *adversos* codd.) ... *Penates*; *Ponto* 1.2.7–8, *vereor ne nomine lecto / durus et aversa* (*adversa* 'dett.') *cetera mente legas*. For the expression *avertere aures*, cf. [Verg.] *Lydia* 27, *Iuppiter avertas aurem*; Liv. 24.26.10; 38.33.11 (cited above); Sen. *Contr.* 1.2.5; Quint. *Decl.* 337 p. 329.29; *ThLL* 2.1510.67–72.

non meus: the use of the possessive pronoun in the sense of *faustus* ("favourable") is not infrequent in Latin poetry and prose, whether applied to people, in which case its sense approaches that of *benevolus* (cf. Ter. *Ad.* 898, *paulatim plebem* ... *facio meam*; Cic. *Quinct.* 29, [Alfenus] *utebatur populo* ... *suo*; *Mil.* 89, *Milone occiso*, [Clodius] *habuisset suos consules*; *ThLL* 8.918.8 ff.), or applied, as here, to the gods, in which case it approximates to *propitius* and *favens*, a predominantly poetic usage (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.396, *vadimus immixtis Danais haud numine nostro*; 12.539–540 *nec di texere Cupencum / Aenea veniente sui*; Ov. *Her.* 12.84, *sed mihi tam faciles unde meosque deos?*; *Met.* 4.373, *vota suos habuere deos* (with Bömer 129); 5.641; 15.820–821, *caesi* ... *parentis* [scil. *Caesaris*] / *nos* [scil. *deos*] *in bella suos fortissimus ultor* [scil. *Octavianus*] *habebit*; Stat. *Theb.* 2.155; *ThLL* 8.918.14–16), or applied to inanimate beings or objects, equivalent to *secundus* (cf. Hor. *Epod.* 9.30, *ventis iturus non suis*; Verg. *Aen.* 5.832, *ferunt sua flamina classem*; Ov. *Ars* 3.584, *ventis* ... *suis*; *Rem.* 264, *sua* ... *aura*; *Her.* 15.72 [= *Tr.* 3.5.4], *vento* ... *suo*; *Met.* 13.195, *orba suis essent* ... *lintea ventis* (with Bömer 254); *Fasti* 4.730, *habent ventos iam mea vela suos*; *Tr.* 1.10.49–50, *ventos* ... *suos*; 5.5.60, *implerent venti si mea vela sui*; Sall. *Iug.* 61.1, *suo loco pugnam facere*; Liv. 38.45, *loco aequo, tempore tuo pugnavisti*; Sen. *Ag.* 91, *vela secundis inflata Notis / ventos nimium timuere suos*; Mart. 10.104.3, *i nostro comes, i, libelle, Flavo longum per mare* ... *cursu facili tuisque ventis*; *i.a.*). For this idiomatic use of the possessive pronoun in the sense of *faustus*, cf. D. R. Shackleton-Bailey, "*On an Idiomatic Use of Possessive Pronouns in Latin*", *CR* 68 (1954) 8–9.

29: *Lydius aurifer* is a reference to the river of Sardis, the capital of Lydia, in Asia Menor, called Pactolus (the present-day Sartçay, cf. J. Keil, *RE* 18.2 [1942] 2439–2440]), which was famed for carrying in its current great quantities of gold nuggets from Mt. Tmolus (present Boz Dag), where it had its source (Hdt. 1.93.1; 5.101.2; Thphr. *Lap.* 47 [with comm. by Eichholz, Oxford 1965]; Str. 13.4.5 p. 625–626; for the extraction of gold from Tmolus, cf. also Hdt. *loc. cit.*; Str. *loc. cit.*; 13.1.23 p. 591; Plin. *Nat.* 33.66; D. Chr. 78.31). As a result the

Pactolus was also called Χρυσορρόας (cf. Plin. *Nat.* 5.110; Hyg. *Fab.* 191). Although this great boon was no longer in evidence in the times of Augustus (cf. Str. 13.1.23 p. 591; 4.5 p. 625 f. and Ov. *Met.* 11.87–88, *Pactolonque petit, quamvis non aureus illo / tempore nec caris erat invidiosus harenis*), the Roman poets, following poetic convention, kept alive its fame as a gold-carrying river and provider of great wealth (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 10.141–142, *ubi pinguia culta / ... Pactolusque inrigat auro*; Prop. 1.6.32, *qua Lydia Pactoli tingit arata liquor*; Sen. *Phoen.* 604–605, *et qua trahens opulenta Pactolus vada / inundat auro rura*), so much so that the Pactolus progressed from being a mere geographical reference denoting Lydia to become, in the case of Lygdamus, a proverbial symbol of wealth (cf. Varro *Men.* 234, *non hos Pactolus aureas undas agens / eripiet unquam e miseriis*; Hor. *Epod.* 15.20, *tibique Pactolus fluat*; Prop. 1.14.11, *tum mihi Pactoli veniunt sub tecta liquores*; 3.18.28; Gratt. 315–316 (with R. Verdière, Wetteren 1964); Sen. *Phoen.* 604; *Oed.* 467, *Pactolos ... Lydius*; Juv. 14.298–299, *non suffecerat aurum, / quod Tagus et rutila volvit Pactolus harena*; cf. Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 261 s.v. *Pactolus* [1320]); cf. also Luc. *Civ.* 3.209–210, (*qua ... refertur*) *passaque ab auriferis tellus exire metallis / Pactolus, qua culta secta non vilior Hermus* (here as a mere geographical reference).

It is important to stress (with Fedeli 328 *ad* Prop. 1.14.11) that this topos was already present in classical Greek poetry (cf. Soph. *Phil.* 394; Lycophr. *Alex.* 272) as well as Hellenistic (cf. *AP* 9.423.4 [Bian.] and Gow-Page, *The Greek Anthology. The Garland of Philip II* [Cambridge 1968] 206). For the legend of Midas as the real aetiological myth behind the *vis aurea* of the river Pactolus, cf. Ov. *Met.* 11.136–145.

The present passage of Lygdamus—since Sil. 1.157–158, *Lydia ... stagna*, seems rather to refer to lake Trasimenus, so called because the Etruscans were believed to have come originally from Lydia; cf. Cic. *Cons.* fr. 2.34 Müller 1879 BT, *Lydius ... haruspex*; Catul. 31.13, *Lydiae lacus undae* (scil. present-day Lago di Garda, with Fordyce 169–170); Verg. *Aen.* 2.781, *Lydius ... Thybris*; 9.11; Sil. 4.719; 10.484, *Lydia castra*; [Verg.] *Cul.* 366, *Lydii ... potentia regis* (scil. *Pursenna*)—is the only case in which the river Pactolus is not mentioned by name. There is another reference to the gold of the Pactolus, in a similar context of rejection of wealth, in Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.60–63, *si Babylonis opes, Lydiae si pondera gazae, / Indorumque dares, Serumque, Arabumque potentes / divitias, mallet cum paupertate pudica / intemerata mori, vitamque impendere famae.*

However, a possibility that cannot be ruled out is that Lygdamus

is using the phrase *Lidius aurifer amnis* to refer to the Hermus, another river proverbially considered rich in gold in Antiquity, together with the Pactolus (of which it was a tributary) and the Tagus (see following note): cf. Verg. *Ge.* 2.137, *aurus turbidus Hermus* (with Mynors 119; Thomas 181); Luc. *Civ.* 3.209–210 (*sup. cit.*); Mart. 6.86.5, *possideat . . . Hermumque Tagumque*; 8.78.5–6, *non illis satis est turbato sordidus auro / Hermus et . . . Tagus*; Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.127, *Hermum fulvoque Tagum . . . limo* (and Vollmer 249); 3.3.61–62, *Hermique vadum, quo Lidius intrat / Bacchus et aurato reficit sua cornua limo* (with Laguna 274–275).

As for *nec . . . regna*, it should be mentioned that it has traditionally been taken in the general sense ("kingdoms") by translators and commentators, who relate this passage to Prop. 1.8B.32, (*Cynthia*) *sine me dulcia regna negat*, and 1.14.23–24, *quae* (scil. *Venus*) *mihi dum placata aderit, non ulla verebor / regna vel Alcinoi munera despicere*. However, Tränkle 99–100 offers a new and fairly plausible interpretation: in [Tib.] 3.7.198–199 *regna Lydia* is used to refer to the kingdom of Croesus; if we interpret the *Lydius* of the Lygdamus passage ἀπὸ κοινοῦ ("neither the kingdom of Lydia nor its gold-bearing river"), we might well understand that here too there is a reference to the kingdom of Croesus, an interpretation that is also supported by literary passages in which the proverbial wealth of Croesus (cf. Catul. 115.3, *cur non divitiis Croesum superare potis?*—see the numerous Latin and Greek occurrences in Otto, *Sprichwörter*, pp. 98–99 s.v. *Croesus* [468])—is linked to the presence of this river in his kingdom (cf. Str. 13.4.5 p. 625 f., ὁ Πακτωλὸς . . . καταφέρων τὸ παλαιὸν ψῆγμα χρυσοῦ πολύ, ἀφ' οὗ τὸν Κροίσου λεγόμενον πλοῦτον . . . διονομασθῆναί φασιν; Prop. 2.26.23, *non si iam Gygae redeant et* **flumina Croesi**; 3.18.28, [*non*] *Croesum . . .*, *Pactoli quas parit umor, opes* [*morti exemerunt*]). Consequently, Tränkle correctly proposes the following translation for this line: "neither to my liking is the kingdom of Croesus with its river of gold . . .". For the motif of the spurning of wealth and a royal throne, cf. Archil. 22 D.; Anacr. 8 D. (= 16 P.); Pi. *P.* 11.52–53; E. *Io.* 621 ff.; *Hipp.* 1013 ff.; Pl. *Merc.* 841, *ibi quidem si regnum detur, non cupita est civitas*; for the rejection of a kingdom as an emphatic statement of the preference for love, cf. Pl. *Curc.* 211, *si equidem hercle mihi regnum detur, numquam id potius persequar*; Hor. *Od.* 2.12.21 ff., *num tu quae tenuit dives Achemenes / aut pinguis Phrygiae Mygdonias opes / permutare velis crine Licymniae, plenas aut Arabum domos / cum . . .?*; Tib. 1.8.34, *et regum magnae despiciantur opes* (with n. by Murgatroyd 244); Prop. 1.14.13; 23–24, (*placata Venere*) *non ulla verebor, regna vel Alcinoi munera despicere* (with Fedeli 333–334);

cf. also Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 297; the motif was already to be found in Hellenistic epigram (eg *AP* 11.3).

Lydius aurifer amnis: for the formulation, cf. Catul. 29.19, *amnis aurifer Tagus* (the gold of the river Tagus also became proverbial; in addition to the passage of Catullus cited, cf. [Verg.] *Catal.* 9.52; Ov. *Am.* 1.15.34 (with McKeown 415–416); *Met.* 2.251 [with Bömer 305]; Mela 3.8; Luc. *Civ.* 7.755; Sen. *Thy.* 354; *Herc. f.* 1325; Sil. 1.155; 16.560; Mart. 1.49.15; 6.86.5; 7.88.7; 10.16.4; 10.96.3; 12.3.3; Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.127; 1.3.108; Juv. 3.54–55; 14.298; Plin. *Nat.* 4.115, *Tagus auriferis harenis celebratur*, Prud. *Sym.* 2.605; Claud. *Carm.* 1.51; 3.102; 17.287; 29.71 Jeep; Boeth. *Cons.* 3.10.7, *non quicquid Tagus aureis harenis / donat*; cf. Blümner, *RE* VII 1564.13 ff.; Schulten, *RE* 2. R. IV 2025.54 ff.; Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 340 s.v. *Tagus* [1737]). According to Tränkle (p. 100) the periphrasis *Lydius . . . amnis* to denote the Pactolus can scarcely be imagined prior to the Flavian period (cf. [Tib.] 3.7.198–199).

30: "nor all the wealth on the face of the earth"; for this hyperbolic expression of the rejection of wealth, cf. Nep. 15 (*Epam.*).4.2, *namque orbis terrarum divitias accipere nolo pro patriae caritate*; Ov. *Met.* 7.59–60, *quemque ego* (scil. *Medea*) *cum rebus, quas totus possidet orbis, / Aesoniden mutasse velim.*

terrarum . . . orbis: "the world", or also the central area of land mass, which the ancients pictured as surrounded by the Ocean and which roughly comprised Europe, Asia and Africa.

sustinet: for its use in connection with the earth, almost in the sense of *tergo portare* ("to carry on one's back"), cf. Pl. *Poen.* prol. 90, *homini . . . quantum hominum terra sustinet sacerrumo.*

31–32: once again Lygdamus here picks up the *alii/ego* antithesis in relation to the content of prayers, previously developed at the beginning of the elegy, and also his desire in the long term: to enjoy a simple and peaceful life with Neaera (3rd priamel; cf. Race, *Classical Priamel*, p. 130; Lygd. 2.1–6 [comm.]). The content and the terms used are clearly Tibullan. For the combination *paupere cultu/*, cf. Tib. 1.10.19–20, *cum paupere cultu / stabat in exigua ligneus aede deus.* For its part, *securus*, describing a quiet life, is also a typically Tibullan concept (cf. Tib. 1.1.48; 77; 3.46; 10.10; 2.1.46; 4.50); see, however, the individual commentary on the term below. The formulation and content of the distich are fairly close to Mart. 5.20.1–2, *si tecum mihi, care Martialis, securis liceat frui diebus.*

31 alii . . . mihi: for the poetic cliché *alius/ego*, cf. E. Bréguet, "Le

thème *alius . . . ego* chez les poètes latins", *REL* 40 (1962) 128–136. "L'opposition entre les diverses formes de vie, d'efforts de groupes indéterminés, et l'ideal, la tâche de vie d'un individu . . . s'exprime par le cliché *alius* (ou un terme de sens analogue), indéfini, désignant le groupe, et *ego* (ou un autre pronom personnel), désignant de façon precise l'individu" (E. Bréguet, *art. cit.*, p. 129). The same cliché is again used by Lygdamus in 5.1–5 (*vos . . . mihi*).

31b–32 liceat . . . posse frui: the formulation is close to Ov. *Her.* 20.74, *irata liceat dum mihi posse frui/*, with the same line-ending and identical pleonasm *liceat . . . posse.*

31 paupere cultu: topos of the poverty of the elegiac poet (see the commentary on l. 23 *paupertas*). The same phrase at the end of a hexameter is found in Tib. 1.10.19.

cultu: ie *cultu vitae* ("way or kind of life"); cf. Cic. *Flac.* 28, *cum . . . tenuissimo cultu viverent*; Verg. *Aen.* 5.730, *gens dura atque aspera cultu*; 8.316; Hor. *Od.* 1.10.2, *feros cultus hominum recentum*; *Sat.* 2.3.323, *cultum maiorem censu*; Liv. 1.39.2, *puerum . . . quem tam humili cultu educamus*; Ov. *Tr.* 3.8.37; 5.10.34; Luc. 3.289; Val.-Max. 2.6.1, *fortitudinem suam effeminato eius* (scil. *Asiae*) *cultu mollire non erubuit*; 9.2 pr., *delicato cultu*; Curt. 9.8.23, *modico . . . cultu*; *OLD cultus* 8; *ThLL* 4.1332.22 ff. (1333.29 ff. for the prosaic and more explicit expression *cultus vitae*).

32 securo: "free from care", "without worry" (< *se-curus*, ie *vacuus a curis*), whether these worries be material or amorous (because of a rival). The studied placing of the adjective between *paupere cultu* and *cara coniuge* underlines the double aspect of *securus*. For the proper elegiac sense of the term ('qui nihil de amantis fide timet aut suspicatur', Pichon, p. 260), cf. Lygd. 4.54; 6.31; [Tib.] 3.16 [= 4.10] 1; Prop. 3.12.19; Ov. *Am.* 1.8.95; 2.19.37, *formosae nimium secure puellae*; *Her.* 18.109; *Ars* 2.443; for the varied nuance of *securus* in the works of Tibullus, cf. W. Wimmel, *Der frühe Tibull*, Monaco 1968, p. 196 n. 45.

cara coniuge: for the expression, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.91, *cara Iovis coniunx*; 8.377 *carissime coniunx*; Ov. *Met.* 7.692–693, *hoc me cum coniuge cara / perdidit* (with Bömer 372); 9.382, *care vale coniunx*; 11.727, *o carissime coniunx* (with Bömer 425); *Tr.* 3.4B.53, *longe carissima coniunx*; *Ponto* 1.8.32, *cum cara coniuge*; Stat. *Silv.* 3.5.110, *carissima coniunx*; *CLE* 542.7, *carissime coniunx* (= *CLE* 965.7; 998.1); 1834 (= *ICV* Diehl 3436).3, *mihi Kariss[ime coniux]*; 1979.1 (= *ICV* Diehl 3885 A).1, *Karissime coniux*; *CIL* 13.3983; the formula is attested in the most diverse forms until a late date (eg *ICV* Diehl 3366, *Koiugi Karissimae*; 4921 [Jewish]); E. Lissberger, *Das Fortleben der römischen Elegiker in der Carmina*

epigraphica, Diss. Tübingen 1934. For the masculine, *coniunx carus* is attested from Ov. *Met.* 9.382; *coniunx carissimus* from Verg. *Aen.* 8.377 (= Ov. *Met.* 11.727).

coniuge . . . frui: for the expression, cf. Tib. 1.5.17, *fruitur nunc alter amore*. The verb *frui* with a personal object means to enjoy the company of the person concerned (cf. Cic. *Fam.* 14.3.3, *di faxint ut tali genero mihi praesenti tecum simul frui liceat*; Mart. 1.86.5, *liceat frui sodale*), but at times such company may have sexual connotations; quite common, in fact, from the early period (cf. Pl. *As.* 918, *ut sinat sese alternas cum illo nostes hac frui*; Ter. *Phorm.* 165) is the use of this verb in connection with the idea of the joy and pleasure of sexual intercourse; cf. Lucr. 4.1105–1106, *cum membris collatis flore fruuntur / aetatis*; Hor. *Od.* 1.5.9, *qui nunc te* (scil. *Pyrrha*) *fruitur*; Ov. *Am.* 2.9B.46, *saepe fruar domina*; *Met.* 9.724, *Iphis amat, qua posse frui desperat* (with Bömer 493–494); Luc. *Carm.* 8(9); *Priap.* 50.5, *puella . . . quae si contigerit fruenda nobis*; *CLE* 960.5–6, *coniuge sum Cadmo fructa Scrateio / concordesque pari viximus ingenio*; cf. also Montero Cartelle, *Latín erótico*, pp. 183–184; Adams, *Lat. sexual vocabulary*, p. 198). There is a similar erotic sense in Greek in the case of the verbs ἀπολαύω (eg Luc. *Am.* 3; Heliod. 1.15.4) and τέρπομαι (applied to the man, cf. *AP* 5.54.2 [Diosc.]; 5.160.2 [Mel.]; applied to the woman, cf. *AP* 5.201.2 [Anon.]).

33–34: invocation to the goddesses Juno and Venus. The association of these two goddesses was familiar to the Roman public from book IV of the *Aeneid*. Both goddesses are referred to here by means of epithets: Juno by that of *Saturnia*, as daughter of Saturn (Chronos), an epithet alien to Greek tradition but familiar to the Latin poets from Enn. *Ann.* 64, but especially from the *Aeneid* (14 times; eg Verg. *Aen.* 1.23) and the *Metamorphoses* (statistics for Ovid in Bömer 521 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 3.271); Venus by that of *Cypria*, "the one from Cyprus", because of her close links with the island, where the first temple was built to her, an epithet attested only here in Roman poetry; however, the fact that Paul. Fest. p. 52 M comments that both *Cypria* and the familiar *Cytherea* are periphrastic expressions for Venus (cf. also Serv. *Aen.* 5.760, *Veneri Idaliae: Cypriae*; *ThLL Supplem.* 2.799.1–5), makes it clear that the epithet *Cypria* is presumably not so new and probably appeared in poetry which has been lost, apart from being frequent in Greek (for Κυπρία, cf. Pi. *O.* 1.75; for Κύπρις, cf. Hom. *Il.* 5.330; 458; *h. Ven.* 2, Κύπρις Ἀφροδίτε; Sapph. 5.1; Liddell & Scott s.v.). The Hellenizing form *Cypris-dis* (*-dos*) (Κύπρις) is attested only in

late Latin; cf. *ThLL Supplem.* 2 (*Onom.* C) 800.61–801.5.

33 adsis: for this ritual formula in hymns and prayers inviting a god to appear, see the commentary on Lygd. 6.1, *candide Liber, ades.*

timidis . . . votis: a typically Ovidian phrase (it never appears before him); cf. Ov. *Met.* 9.546, *cogor opemque tuam timidis exposcere votis* (with Bömer 441); *Ponto* 2.8.51, *adnuite o timidis, mitissima numina, votis* (the same place in the hexameter); cf. also Ov. *Am.* 2.6.43, *quid referam timidae pro te pia vota puellae?*; *Tr.* 5.8.28, *molle cor ad timidas sic habet ille* (scil. *Caesar*) *preces.*

Saturnia: *scil.* Juno, invoked as the goddess who protected women, and more particularly, properly-married women, the *matronae.* Juno was the divine prototype of woman, but above all the goddess of matrimony or wedded union (*Juno Gamelia*), and of motherhood (*Juno Lucina*); in short, the ideal model of wife.

Although the epithet *Saturnia*, which was quite alien to Greek tradition, was known in Latin literature from as early as Enn. *Ann.* 64, it owes its successful dissemination among the Latin poets to the influence of Virgil's *Aeneid*, and in particular to its last six books, where the appearances of the epithet multiply dramatically, corresponding to the role the goddess plays in this part of the work as defender of the established order, of the native traditions of the *Saturnia tellus* (cf. L. A. McKay, "*Saturnia Iuno*", *G & R* 3 (1956) 59–60): 14 times, 4 in the first six books, 10 in the last six; 5 times substantivized (*Aen.* 1.23; 4.92; 7.428; 560; 622); 7 times in the phrase *Saturnia Iuno* (*Aen.* 3.380; 5.606; 9.745; 802; 10.706; 12.156), once *Saturnia . . . regina* (*Aen.* 7.572–573), once *Saturnia coniunx* (*Aen.* 12.178). Lygdamus respects the position the epithet always occupies in Virgil's hexameter: after the hephthemimer and before the last foot (¦¦ *Sātūrnĭă* - ˘). The connotations of *Aetas aurea* heavily colour this epithet from the *Eclogues* onwards (*Saturnia regna/* in *Ecl.* 4.6; 6.41; *Aen.* 11.252; cf. *Aen.* 1.569, *Saturnia arva/*). Statistics for Ovid simply confirm the widespread use eventually made of the epithet (cf. Bömer 521 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 3.271).

34–35 faveas . . ./ et faveas: verbs like *iuvare, ferre opem* and *favere* habitually appear in hymns or prayers to ask a god for their goodwill or assistance in carrying out a particular undertaking (*coepta, conamina, incepta, laborem*) or in realizing a dream (*vota*); cf. Verg. *Aen.* 9.625b, *audacibus adnue coeptis* (= *Ge.* 1.40b); Tib. 2.5, *Phoebe, fave*; [Tib.] 3.11.9, *magne Geni, cape tura libens votisque faveto*; Ov. *Met.* 3.613, *o faveas nostrisque laboribus adsis*; Sil. 15.161, *ne spernes iuvare labores*; Laguna

165–166 *ad* Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.112; Appel, *De Roman. precationibus*, pp. 127–130. The purpose of the repetition (*faveas . . . faveas*) is to stress the intensity of the prayer.

The verb *favere* is eminently poetic in tone. The 74 appearances listed in the *Dictionnaire fréquentiel et index inverse de la langue latine* (Liège, L.A.S.L.A. 1981), are subdivided into 28 for prose and 46 for poetry, of which 8 are from Virgil and 15 from the *Corpus Tibullianum* (I–II: 7; III: 8); cf. J. Hellegouarc'h, "*Parce, precor* . . . ou Tibulle et la prière". Étude stylistique", *Illinois Classical Studies* 14 (1989) 55. In Lygdamus it reappears in 4.44.

34 concha, Cypria, vecta tua: scil. Venus, an ancient, lesser Latin deity, possibly protector of gardens, assimilated from the 2nd c. BC to the Greek Aphrodite, whose personality and legends she assumed. Venus is invoked here as goddess of love. According to legend, after being born from the white sea-foam, Venus travelled across the stormy waves on a seashell, driven by the humid Zephyrus to the shores of Cyprus (cf. Fulg. *Myth.* 2.1 p. 40; P. Grimal, p. 11). The shell as sea-symbolizing attribute of this goddess is first attested in Latin literature in Pl. *Rud.* 704, *te* (scil. *Venerem*) *ex concha natam esse autumant, cave tu harum* **conchas** *spernas*, where Plautus has Venus born from a shell and may be playing with the figurative and obscene sense of the term (= *femenina pudenda*; *ThLL* 4.29.25–26; *OLD concha* 3b), although Montero Cartelle (*Latín erótico*, pp. 49 and 228) rules out this possibility. However, after Plautus the motif of the shell of Venus only reappears sporadically, in Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.118, *haec et caeruleis mecum consurgere digna / fluctibus, et nostra potuit considere concha*; 3.4.5, *inque sua ducet super aequora concha*, where (with Laguna 312) *concha* subliminally suggests the passive homosexuality of the *castratus* Earinus, as it does in the case of one *Gallus* (pseudonym for *castratus*) in Mart. 2.47.2, *levior o conchis, Galle, Cytheriacis*; Paul. Fest. p. 52 M (= p. 36 Thewrewk), *Cytherea, Venus, ab urbe Cytherea, in quam primum devecta esse dicitur concha, cum in mari esset concepta*; Sidon. *Ep.* 4.8.5 vers. 1, *pistrigero quae concha vehit Tritone Cytheren*; Fulg. *Myth.* 2.1; *ThLL* 4.28.8–21; *OLD concha* 2c. Both in Lygdamus and in Statius the image of the goddess moving about on her shell is interpreted as a sign of her benevolence, but—as observed by Axelson ("Geburtsjahr", p. 294)—in Statius the shell functions as a vehicle, while in Lygdamus it is purely ornamental.

For both Büchner ("Lygdamus", p. 100) and Tränkle 101, it would be rash to draw chronological conclusions from this detail of the shell of Venus, since the shell as an attribute of Aphrodite is also

attested in Greek literature (cf. Dümmler, "Aphrodite", RE 1.2 [1894] 2786); in Call. *Epigr.* 5 Pf. the ex voto from Arsinoe to Aphrodite is a shell. In the plastic arts, Venus-Aphrodite is occasionally represented from the 4th c. BC as standing or sitting on a shell; prominent among these representations is the famous mid 1st century AD fresco from the 'Casa della Venere in conchiglia', found in Pompeii in 1952 (cf. A. Maiuri, *Roman Painting* 1953, p. 7; B. Andreae, *Römische Kunst*, Freiburg-Breisgau 1977^3, plate 73). L. Lenaz (in A. La Penna [1989] 361) points out that this image of Venus is part of funerary symbolism and is consequently first found on sarcophagi (*Enc. arte classica*, VII 1128). Line 34 may therefore already constitute part of the atmosphere of mourning that marks the end of the elegy.

Cypria: for this epithet of Venus, see the commentary on ll. 23–24. As regards the scansion, *Cyprius* is found in Enn. *Var.* 26; Hor. *Od.* 3.29.60; Ov. *Met.* 3.220; 10.645; Sen. *Her. O.* 196; Marcell. Emp. *Med.* 32; *Cyprius*, in addition to Lygd. 3.34, is found in Hor. *Od.* 1.1.13 and Sidon. *Carm.* 2.473; cf. *ThLL Onom.* C 798.68 ff. (the Hellenizing form *Cypris*, Gr. Κύπρις, appears among the Romans only from the *Anthologia Latina*; cf. *ThLL Onom.* C 800.61–801.5).

35–38: a doleful ending of great pathos, very much in the style of the author (cf. 1.28; 2 *passim*). Once again Lygdamus makes use in this elegy of a conditional clause (cf. ll. 27 ff., *at si* . . .) as a hyperbolic form of expression of his love for Neaera: if previously it served to express the idea "without Neaera I do not want wealth", it now imperiously links the poet's life to the return to him of his beloved. The emotional blackmail of suicide, "without Neaera I do not want to live", at the same time a supreme declaration of love, can be felt to be underlying these words as in the second elegy of the cycle.

35 si fata negant: an unmistakably Ovidian formula, first attested, in fact, in this poet; cf. Ov. *Met.* 10.38, *quod si fata negant veniam* (with Bömer 26); 633–634, *quodsi* . . . *mihi coniugium fata inportuna negarent*; 13.131–132, *quem* (viz. *Achillem mortuum*) *quoniam non aequa mihi vobisque negarunt fata* (with Bömer 239); cf. also Sen. *Tro.* 511, *fata si* . . . *vitam negant*; Sil. 1.107–108, *si fata negarint, dedecus id* . . . *depellere*; *CLE* 473.3, *vitam cui fata negarunt*; 1041.8, *fata animam dederant fata eademque negant*; 1066.3, *fata negarunt*; 1504.11, *unde fata negant redire quemquam* (a line modelled on Catul. 3.12); E. Lissberger, *Das Fortleben der römischen Elegiker in der Carmina epigraphica*, Diss. Tübingen 1934, p. 20. The opposite of this expression is the Virgilian *fata sinunt* (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.18, *si qua*

fata sinant; 4.651, *dum fata deusque sinebat*; 6.869–870, *fata . . . sinent*; 11.701, *dum fallere fata sinebant)*, amply echoed in Ovid, particularly in the negative form; cf. Tib. 1.1.69, *dum fata sinunt*; Ov. *Met.* 5.534, *non ita fata sinunt* (with Bömer 361); 8.786; 11.408; 13.624; *Tr.* 5.3.5; *CLE* 1144.8; 1786d.1; 2075.1, *dum fata sinunt* (= *ILCV* 2211.1); *ThLL* 6.362.75 ff.; G. Sanders, *Licht en Duisternis in de christelijke Grafschriften*, Bruxelles 1965, p. 171 (with review by F. Bömer, *Gymnasium* 73 [1966] 560).

The participation of the *fata* in human destiny was crystallized in numerous expressions of this type: *fata iubent* (cf. Acc. *Trag.* 481; Cic. *Pis.* 61: *Carm. frag.* 41.6 B. [= 42.6 Bue.]; Ov. *Met.* 15.584 [with Bömer 409]; Sen. *Her. O.* 180; Luc. *Civ.* 8.520; Petr. *Satyr.* 123 l. 220; *ThLL* 6.362.25 ff.); *fata urgent* or *fatum urget* (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.653; Liv. 5.22.8; 5.36.6; Luc. *Civ.* 10.30; Tac. *Germ.* 33; Val.-Flac. 4.252); *fata vocent* (cf. Lygd. 3.37 *me vocet* [comm.]); *fata dant* (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.337; 11.112; Hor. *Od.* 4.13.23; Prop. 2.1.17; 3.1.17; Ov. *Met.* 7.692 [with Bömer 372]; 10.163; 14.843–844 [with Bömer 247]; *Tr.* 3.7.13–14; 4.10.52; Luc. *Civ.* 1.114; *CLE* 377.1; 420.20; 475.4; 490.6; 544.4 [= *CIL* 6.36658); 842.1; 856.3; 1021.4; 1058.3; 1111.20; 1219.1; 1237.14; 1636.21; 1685.7; 1993.1); *ThLL* 6.361.1.71–79; E. Lissberger, *Das Fortleben der römischen Elegiker in der Carmina epigraphica*, Diss. Tübingen 1934, p. 21); *fata volunt* (cf. Lygd. 5.32, *seu nos fata fuisse velint* [comm.]); cf. also Ov. *Met.* 3.548, *si fata vetabant*; 11.452, *si me modo fata remittant.*

fata . . . tristesque sorores: for the copulative combination of *fata* with the Parcae, cf. Stat. *Ach.* 1.255, *nil humildes Parcas terrenaque fata vererer.*

negant: the verb *negare* is used here in the sense of "to say no to a request or entreaty" (cf. Cic. *Or.* 140, *negare roganti*; *OLD nego* 3a).

reditum . . . tristesque sorores: for the expression, cf. Hor. *Epod.* 13.15–16, *unde tibi reditum certo subtemine Parcae / rupere.*

reditum: ie *Neaerae reditum ad me.*

tristesque sorores: scil. *Parcae.* Originally only one Parca acted as the Roman deity of birth—hence the name; cf. Varro *Gramm.* 132 [= Gell. 3.16.10], *nam Parca inmutata una littera **a partu** nominata*—but, subsequently identified by false etymology with the Greek Μοῖραι—*Parca* being erroneously derived from *pars*—, she became assimilated to the latter in number and attributes as inflexible divinities of human destiny: it is they who are entrusted with pointing to and carrying out the destiny of the individual—death, above all, in the case of mortals—as decreed by destiny in general or by fate (μοῖρα, *parca*, *fatum*). In the Homeric scheme the Moirai-Parcae, daughters of

Zeus and Themis, are represented as three spinning sisters (Atropos, Clotho and Lachesis) who regulate the lifetime of every mortal, from birth to death, with the help of a thread (*pulla et fatalia stamina*) which the first one spins, the second winds and the third cuts, the moment when human existence comes to an end. In the Forum, the three Parcae—one of whom presides over birth; another, marriage and the third, death—were represented by three statues, commonly called *tria Fata*, "the three Fates". Lygdamus' allusion to the Parcae, having invoked the aid of Juno and Venus, can be understood if we bear in mind that the power of the Parcae-Moirai was above that of the gods themselves since, even if they wished to do so, they could not overturn the human destiny already spun by the relentless sisters; cf. Tib. 1.7.1–2, *hunc cecinere diem Parcae fatalia nentes / stamina, non ulli dissoluenda deo*; for the idea that the *Fata* are above the gods, including Zeus, cf. also Hom. *Od.* 3.236 ff.; A. *Pr.* 517–518; Hdt. 1.91; Verg. *Aen.* 5.798; 12.147–148; Ov. *Met.* 9.433–434, *vos* (= *deos*) *etiam, . . . me* (= *Iovem*) *quoque fata regunt*; 15.780–781; *Tr.* 5.3.17–18; only occasionally does Zeus control and intervene in Destiny as he pleases; cf. Hom. *Il.* 8.69 ff.; 16.434; 441–442; on *Fatum*, cf. Bömer 318–319 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.305–306; I. Kajanto, *Ovid's Conception of Fate*, Annales Universitatis Turkuensis B 80, 1961; E. Kraggerud, *SO* 40 (1965) 69,3); *RE* 6.2 2047–2051 s.v. *Fatum*. That is to say, the goddesses of love and marriage may well listen to Lygdamus' appeal, but it may be that Juno and Venus can do nothing to help him, even though they might wish to do so, if the Parcae have already spun Lygdamus' fate and decreed that he should not recover Neaera. On this twofold condition for a wish to be fulfilled in the future, that the gods should be favourable and acquiesce to it, and that the Parcae should not spin a contrary destiny, cf. Mart. 6.58.7–8, *si mihi lanificae ducunt non pulla sorores stamina nec surdos vox habet ista deos*. The Parcae span the future life of a man on the very day of his birth; cf. Hom. *Il.* 20.127–128; 24.209–210; *Od.* 7.196–198. On these fatal deities, cf. Peter in Roscher II, pp. 211 ff.; III, 1569 ff.; Wissowa, *RuK*², p. 264; K. Latte, *Römische Religiongeschichte*, München 1960, p. 52; Walde-Hofmann, *LEW* II, pp. 251–252; P. C. van der Horst, "Fatum, tria Fata; Parca, tres Parcae," *Mnemosyne* 11 (1943) 217–227; Grimal, *Mitología*, pp. 407–408 s.v. *Parcas*; p. 364 s.v. *Moiras*; Guirand, *Mitología general*, p. 234; Ruiz de Elvira, *Mitología clásica*, pp. 61–62.

sorores: «a sinister euphemism for the three Parcae who spin the

fates of men» in the words of Nisbet-Hubbard 62 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 2.3.15–16). Of all the various groups of mythological sisters (Nereides, Danaides, Hesperides, Erinyes, etc.) referred to collectively in poetry as *sorores*, the most important, in that they are the most frequently cited, are the Parcae and the Muses. In general an epithet or numeral avoids ambiguity; thus, when the poet refers to the Parcae he stresses that the sisters are three in number (cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.3.15–16, *dum ... sororum fila trium ... atra*; Prop. 2.13.44, *quaevis de tribus una soror*; Ov. *Met.* 2.654, *triplices ... deae*; 8.452, *triplices ... sorores*; 15.808–809, *sororum ... trium*; though the phrase *triplices sorores* is also applied to the Eumenides [cf. Ov. *Met.* 8.481] and the Minyeides [cf. Ov. *Met.* 4.425]) or applies terms to them which refer, as here (*tristes* = *severae*), to their character—severe, sinister, dire, inexorable and ill-omened (cf. Sen. *Her.* f. 181, *durae ... sorores* [= *CLE* 2296.14]; Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.21, *nigrae ... sorores* [= *Theb.* 6.376]; *Theb.* 11.75, *atra soror*; cf. Prop. 4.11.13, *immites ... Parcas*; Ov. *Ponto* 1.8.64, *fatales ... deae*; Stat. *Theb.* 5.274, *tristes ... Parcae*; Mart. 4.73.6, *tetricas ... deas*; 7.96.4, *tetricae ... deae*)—or to their function as spinners (cf. Mart. 6.58.7, *lanificae ... sorores*); in the funerary context of epitaphs, the identity of the *sorores*—almost always described as breaking the dead man's thread of fate—leaves no room for doubt (cf. *CLE* 443.5; 456.4 [= *ILCV* 400]; 493.8; 494.2; 1011.5 [= *CIL* 11.5357]; 1523.4; 2296.14). *Tristis* is also a very frequent epithet for the gods and inhabitants of the underworld (cf. Sen. *Herc. f.* 610, *tristes deos*; Verg. *Aen.* 5.733–734, *impia ... Tartara ... tristes umbras*; 6.315, *navita ... tristis* [scil. *Charon*]), for the Stygian Lake (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.438, *tristique palus inamabilis unda*; Hor. *Od.* 2.14.8–9, *tristi / ... unda*), for Hell itself (cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.4.46, *regnaque tristia*; Verg. *Aen.* 4.243, *Tartara tristia*) and for death (cf. Ov. *Met.* 15.762–763, *triste ... letum*). In Ov. *Met.* 15.781 there is a reference to the Parcae (the only occasion) as *veterum ... sororum*, aged because they belong to one of the first generations of immortals, prior to the Olympians (Bömer 462 *ad loc.* explains *veteres* as an enallage for *decreta*, and cites the phrase *vetus fatum*; cf. [Verg.] *Cul.* 145; Luc. *Civ.* 10.88; Stat. *Theb.* 1.503). For other epithets, cf. Sen. *Ag.* 759, *sorores squalidae* (scil. *Parcae*); *CIL* 6.30114, *cum mea Lethaeae ruperunt fila sorores* (scil. *Parcae*).

However, the adjective which most frequently accompanies the term *sorores* in reference to the Muses is undoubtedly *doctae* (cf. eg Lygd. 4.45, *doctaeque sorores* [comm.]); in other cases their number—nine—is specified (cf. Naev. *frg.* 1, *novem Iovis concordes filiae sorores*; Mart.

2.22.1, *o Phoebe novemque sorores*). Sometimes, however, both groups are referred to simply as *sorores*, but in this case the context makes it perfectly clear whether the reference is to the Muses (eg [Verg.] *Aetna* 6–8, *tecumque faventes in nova Pierio properent a fonte sorores vota*; Prop. 2.30B.27–28, *sorores / ... canere*; 3.1.17, *de monte sororum*) or the Parcae (eg Ov. *Am.* 1.3.18, *fila sororum* [the same line-ending is found in *CIL* 3.11229.5 = *CLE* 1011.5; Sil. 3.96]; *Her.* 12.3, *quae dispensant mortalia fata sorores*; 15.81–82, *sive ita nascenti legem dixere sorores / nec data sunt vitae fila severa meae*; *Tr.* 5.3.17, *dominae fati ... sorores*; Luc. *Civ.* 6.703, *fila sorores*; Mart. 11.36.4–5, *veluti iam rupta sororum / fila*; cf. Carter, *Epitheta deorum*, 1902, p. 82.

36: at the end of the pentameter all the mss. have *neunt*, a reading accepted by most modern editors and commentators. This traditional reading is supported by a series of passages describing how the Parcae spin an individual's future lifespan, such as Verg. *Ecl.* 4.47, *concordes stabili fatorum numine Parcae*; [Albinov.] *Liv.* 164; Stat. *Theb.* 4.600–601, *hos neverat annos / Atropos*; Mart. 1.88.9, *cum mihi supremos Lachesis perneverit annos.* To explain the irregular *neunt* (for *nent*, by analogy with *eunt*), these scholars quote the *Vetus Latina Matth.* 6.28 and *Luc.* 12.27, as well as a *doleunt* which appears in some inscriptions prior to 250 AD; cf. *CIL* 3.10347 (= *CLE* 820.1), *quem flentes doleunt miserique parente[s]*; 5.1706; *ThLL* 55.1 1820.15–16. However, these are late examples, and ones from lower linguistic registers, and are therefore not convincing enough to support such a reading in an author as erudite as Lygdamus. For this reason N. Heinsius (*ad* Ov. *Her.* 17.194 and in *Ex adversariis*) put forward the emendation *canunt*, a reading supported by the pentameter *CLE* 1141.16, (*Parcae*) *quae vitam pensant quaeque futura canunt* (2nd c. AD or later). It would seem logical for the first part of the pentameter to deal with the physical act of spinning and the second part the future consequences of this action. The image of the Parcae prophesying—in song—while spinning was familiar to the Romans from Catul. 64.305–381; Tib. 1.7.1–2, *hunc cecinere diem Parcae fatalia nentes / stamina*; Ov. *Tr.* 5.3.25–26, *hanc legem nentes fatalia Parcae stamina ... cecinere tibi*; for the prophetic song of the Parcae at the very moment of birth, cf. also Pl. *R.* 617C; [Tib.] 3.11.3–4, *te nascente novum Parcae cecinere puellis / servitium et dederunt regna superba tibi*; Ov. *Met.* 8.451–457; *Tr.* 5.3.17–18; Hyg. *Fab.* 171.

Further support for the reading *canunt* is the fact that it was normal to sing while spinning to pass away the long hours of tedious work; cf. Hom. *Od.* 5.61–62 (Calypso); 10.221–222 (Circe); E. *Hypsipyle*

3(1).11–12, οὐ τάδε πῆνας, οὐ τάδε κερκίδος /ἱστοτόνου παραμύθια Λήμνια; Verg. *Ge.* 1.293–294, *interea longum cantu solata laborem / arguto coniunx percurrit pectine telas* (with Mynors 67).

quae . . . quaeque: for the pleonastic repetition of the relative pronoun, see the commentary on Lygd. 2.4.

stamina . . . ducunt: for the poetic periphrasis *stamina ducere* ("to pull the threads" = "to spin"), cf. Catul. 64.312, *dextera. . . . deducens fila*; 327, *currite ducentes subtegmina, currite, fusi*; Tib. 1.3.86, (*anus*) ***deducat*** *plena* ***stamina*** *longa colu*; 6.78, ***ducit*** *inops tremula* ***stamina*** *torta manu*; Ov. *Met.* 14.265, *nec fila sequentia ducunt* (*nymphae*); Cels. 7.7.11, *acu duo lina ducente*; in connection with the Parcae spinning fate, in addition to the passages of Catullus cited, cf. Mart. 6.58.7–8, *si mihi lanificae* ***ducunt*** *non pulla sorores /* ***stamina*** *nec surdos vox habet ista deos*; Juv. 12.65, *Parcae meliora . . . pensa manu ducunt.* Cf. *OLD ducere* 21a and 23c; *ThLL* 5.1 2147.17–18. For a description of the ancient loom, its components and the way it was used, see Mynors 67 *ad* Verg. *Ge.* 1.293–294 (with bibliography).

37–38: Lygdamus alludes here (with L. Lenaz, in A. La Penna [1989] 362) to the well-known amatory motif that "the wounds of love can only be washed with the water of Hell"; that is, unrequited love can only be forgotten in death, after drinking the water of Lethe (cf. Lygd. 1.28 *pallida Ditis aqua* [comm.]). This image seems to date back to Euphorion (cf. fr. 43 Powell, Κώκυτος <τοι> μοῦνος ἀφ' ἕλκεα νίψεν Ἄδωνιν), presumably the source for Gallus, to whom Propertius may be referring in 2.34.91–92, *Gallus / mortuus inferna vulnera* (scil. *amoris ad Lycorida*) *lavit aqua* (with Enk 465), where again this image brings the elegy (and book II) to a close. In this distich Lygdamus wishes to highlight the vastness and loneliness, the darkness and ghostly pallor of Hell and its rivers (*vastos amnes nigramque paludem . . . ignavam luridus . . . aquam*), an image familiar to the Roman poets from book VI of the *Aeneid.*

37: in the *Odyssey* (10.513–514) there is a description of the subterranean world of Hell, mentioning as rivers of the lower territory the Acheron, the Phlegethon and the Cocytus (which flows from the Styx), the last two as tributaries of the Acheron. Their purpose is to prevent the living, by means of their raging current, from entering the dwelling-place of Hades (Hom. *Od.* 11.156–159). Virgil, for his part, does not situate the underworld rivers with particular precision (cf. *Aen.* 6.265; 295–297), unlike Plato, who has has left us a wonderful detailed description (cf. Pl. *Phd.* 113 a–c).

The Acheron is the river which souls have to cross to reach the

kingdom of the dead (Cic. *Tusc.* 1.10, *travectio Acherontis*; *CIL* 6.21521, *non Acheronteis transvehar umbra vadis*). The river is virtually stagnant; its banks are swamplike and covered in reedbeds. This underworld river takes its characteristics from a river of the same name in Epirus, on the west coast of mainland Greece, which near its mouth formed an unhealthy marsh in a desolate landscape (cf. Pl. *Phd.* 113 a; Verg. *Aen.* 6.295; Ov. *Met.* 5.539). The Cocytus, a tributary of the Acheron in the upperworld, is the river of lamentation; its extremely cold current flows parallel to the Styx (cf. Pl. *Phd.* 113 c; Cic. *Tusc.* 1.10, *Cocyti fremitus*; Verg. *Ge.* 3.38; 4.478–479; *Aen.* 6.297; 323; Hor. *Od.* 2.14.18; Stat. *Theb.* 8.30), as does that of the Phlegethon (or Pyriphlegethon), the river of flames (cf. Pl. *Phd.* 113 a–b; [Verg.] *Cul.* 272, *Phlegethonta furentem ardentibus undis*; Verg. *Aen.* 6.265 [Serv. *ad loc.*]; 550–551; Stat. *Theb.* 4.55; Ov. *Met.* 5.554; 15.532; Sen. *Phaed.* 1227). The Styx is a river which has its source in Arcadia and is then lost underground; according to an interpolated passage of the *Theogony* (Hes. *Th.* 788–794) it is made up of ten branches, one of which forms the Oceanus, the other nine surrounding the circle of the earth. The Styx also flows nine times round Hell in Virgil's description (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.438–439; cf. Pl. *Phd.* 113 b–c).

For the identification of the waters of the underworld with the idea of death, cf. eg Ov. *Tr.* 1.2.65–66, *mittere me Stygias si iam voluisset in undas Caesar.*

me vocet: for this use of *vocare* in connection with death and Hell, cf. *CLE* 2075.1–2 (= *ILCV* 2211.1–2), *vive deo dum fata sinunt, nam curva senectus / te rapit et Ditis ianua nigra vocat.* Note, too, the familiar phrase *fata vocant*; eg Verg. *Ge.* 4.496; *Aen.* 6.147, *si te fata vocant*; 10.471; 11.97; Ov. *Her.* 6.28; 7.1; Sen. *Her. f.* 396; Sil. 4.508; Just. 18.6.5; Claud. 26.171.

vastos amnes: the closest parallels are Lucr. 1.115, *an tenebras Orci visat vastasque lacunas*; [Verg.] *Cul.* 374, *vastum Phlegethonta*; [Albinov.] *Obit.* 1.6, *in vastos . . . lacus. Vastus* here suggests solitude and fear as much as it does extension of space (cf. Fordyce 297 *ad* Catul. 64.156 *vasta Charybdis*; Lygd. 4.85 *vasti . . . aequora ponti* [comm.]). The sensation of vastness and emptiness is not limited to the rivers, but rather vastness is characteristic of Hell in its entirety; cf. Enn. *Scen.* 139 V. (= 152 J.), *inferum vastos specus*; Lucr. 1.115 *sup. cit.*; Verg. *Aen.* 6.237, *spelunca alta fuit vastoque immanis hiatu*; 269, *perque domos Ditis vacuas et inania regna*; 295–296, *turbidus hic coeno vastaque voragine gurges / aestuat*; Ov. *Met.* 10.30, *per Chaos hoc ingens vastique silentia regni*; 11.670, *inania*

Tartara; Sen. *Her. f.* 664–666, *hic ora solvit Ditis invisi domus / hiatque rupes alta et inmenso specu / ingens vorago faucibus vastis patet*; 718–719, *hic vasto specu / pendent tyranni limina.*

nigramque paludem: for this phrase, cf. Sil. 13.573, *Acheron . . . descendit nigra lentus per stagna palude.* Darkness was not simply one of the characteristics of the Hell of the ancients, but one of the fears it held; cf. Lucr. 3.1011, *Cerberus et Furiae iam vero et lucis egestas*; Hor. *Od.* 1.4.16, *iam te premet nox*; Sen. *Ep.* 24.18, *nemo tam puer est ut Cerberum timeat et tenebras.* The adjective "black" is frequently applied in Latin poetry to anything connected with death and/or Hell, being equivalent in practice to *infernus*; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.134, *nigra . . . Tartara*; Hor. *Od.* 1.24.18, *nigro . . . gregi* (scil. *animarum*); 2.3.15–16, *Sororum / fila trium . . . atra*; Prop. 2.14.17–18, *ater . . . Cocytos*; 4.11.2, *ianua nigra*; 5, *fuscae . . . deus aulae*; Tib. 1.3.4, *Mors . . . nigra* (for *niger* as an epithet of death, cf. also Stat. *Theb.* 9.851; Sil. 13.560); Ov. *Her.* 2.72, *nigri regia caeca dei*; *Tr.* 1.2.22, *Tartara nigra*; Sen. *Her. O.* 1705, *negri regna . . . Iovis*; Stat. *Theb.* 6.376, *nigrae . . . sorores*; Lygd. 5.5, *nigram . . . horam*; cf. also André, *Termes de couleur*, p. 51. The phrase *nigra palus* here refers to the Stygian lake or the river Styx, whose waters were believed to have magical properties, and by which the gods of Olympus solemnly swore from Hom. *Il.* 15.37–38 (cf. also *Od.* 5.185–186; Laguna 190 *ad* Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.186). On the proverbial blackness of the Stygian waters, cf. Ov. *Met.* 11.500, (*pontus*) *Stygia modo nigrior unda* (with Bömer 371). In Virgil the underworld Styx meanders nine times round the kingdom of Hell (Verg. *Ge.* 4.480). For the rivers and lakes of the underworld depicted as black, cf. also Pi. *Fr.* 114 Bowra; Verg. *Ge.* 1.243, *Styx atra* (= Sen. *Phaed.* 477; *Herc. O.* 1921); 4.478; *Aen.* 6.132; Hor. *Od.* 2.14.17–18 (*Cocytus*); Stat. *Theb.* 4.521–523.

38: the traditional reading of this line (*dives in ignava luridus Orcus aqua*) is, in principle, acceptable and feasible (cf. M. Schuster, *Tibull-Studien* [1930] 153–154): although the asyndetic accumulation of adjectives (*dives . . . luridus*) is quite striking, it is not completely unparalleled in Latin poetry; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.384, *ignotus egens*; 10.837, *aeger anhelans*; 12.930, *humilis supplex*; [Tib]. 3.8.19–20, *niger . . . proximus Eois . . . Indus aquis* (for Schuster *Dives Orcus* is a poetic variant for *Dis Pater*). However, the phenomenon is very rare from the Augustan period on and there is no other comparable example in the elegies of Lygdamus, since in 3.29 (*Lydius aurifer amnis*), 5.22 (*dura . . . tertia regna*) and 4.5–6 (*venturae nuntia sortis . . . Tuscis exta probata*), one of the two attributes (*aurifer*, *tertia*, *nuntia*) is so close to the noun that it forms

together with it a unit capable of accepting further adjectival qualification. A second problem is the prepositional syntagma *in ignava . . . aqua*. Supporters of the traditional reading find syntactic support for the construction *dives* + delimitative *in* in Ov. *Met.* 5.302, *dives in arvis* (with Bömer 303); Plin. *Nat.* 6.111; subsequently also in the *Itala* and later. However, the question is basically a semantic one, since when seen in this light it does not seem to add anything with respect to the hexameter. All in all, this has stirred up, for some time now, more than reasonable doubts about the authenticity of the transmitted text. Among the many diverse proposals to correct it, the most credible is that of N. Heinsius (*Ex adversariis*), *Ditis et ignavam . . . aquam*. Tränkle 103–104 supports this *emendatio* of Heinsius on the following grounds: 1) A lengthy three-element phrase is also to be found in an analogous context in Lygd. 5.23–24, *Elysios olim liceat cognoscere campos / Lethaeamque ratem Cimmeriosque lacus*. For *-que . . . et*, cf. 2.23–24, *-que . . . et*; 4.44, *-que . . . et. . . . -que*; 1.9 ff., *et . . . -que . . . atque*. 2) For *Ditis . . . ignavam . . . aquam*, apart from Lygd. 1.28, cf. [Verg.] *Cul.* 372–273, *Ditis opacos . . . lacus*; Mart. 9.29.2, *ad infernas . . . Ditis aquas*; Stat. *Theb.* 7.782–783, *atraque Ditis flumina*. 3) *Orcus* can perfectly well be taken as denoting place, since there are examples from Varro *Men.* 423, *inimicum Orco immitere*, which leave no doubt (cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 2.398, *multos Danaum demittimus Orco*). The verb *vocet* cannot be adduced as an argument against this, since the whole expression of the distich is a variation on the expression *fata vocant*, which is common in Latin poetry from Virgil on, and which alluded to the proximity of death (cf. Ov. *Her.* 7.1–2, *sic ubi fata vocant, . . . concinit albus olor*). For my part I would simply add, to qualify point 3), that the two meanings of *Orcus*, the local and the personal, may at times appear together (for such cases of ambiguity, cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.18.30 [with Nisbet-Hubbard 307]; *RE* 18.1.915 ff.). Related, then, to the local sense, "Hell", is the physical description of the place, while the personal Orcus explains the use of *vocat*.

Ditis . . . Orcus: for the identification of *Orcus* with *Dis* (or *Pluto*), cf. Enn. *Var.* 78, *Pluto Latine est Dis pater, alii Orcum vocant*. On *Dis*, see Lygd. 1.28 *Ditis* (comm.).

ignavam . . . aquam: ie 'languide ac tarde fluentem'. The poets tend to describe the rivers of Hell as not only gloomy but also *lenti* (cf. Prop. 4.11.15, *vada lenta, paludes*; Sil. 13.573, *Acheron . . . descendit nigra lentus per stagna palude*), *languidi* (cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.14.17–18, *ater flumine languido Cocytos errans* [with Nisbet-Hubbard 232]; Sen. *Her. f.* 554,

nigro pelagus gurgite languidum) or *inertes* (cf. Ov. *Met.* 4.434; Sen. *Herc. f.* 686, *palus inertis foeda Cocyti iacet*). The image comes from Greek literature (cf. Pi. *Fr.* 130, ἔνθεν τὸν ἄπειρον ἐρεύγονται σκότον / βληχροὶ [= *languidi*] δνοφερᾶς νυκτὸς ποταμοί). Sometimes this "sluggish" water of the underworld rivers is described as a fish; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 9.104–105, *dixerat idque ratum Stygii per flumina fratris, / per pice torrentis atraque voragine ripas / adnuit*; Claud. *Carm. in Rufinum* 1.120, *Phlegethonta sonorum / poscit, et ambusto flagrantis ab aggere ripae / ingentem piceo succendit gurgite pinum.* According to Broukhusius (p. 311), *ignava Orci aqua* may refer to the *Lethe*; cf. Sen. *Her. f.* 680, *placido quieta labitur Lethe vado, / demitque curas: neve remeandi amplius / pateat facultas, flexibus multis gravem / involvit amnem.* But others would rather see here an allusion to the Cocytus; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.132, *tenet media omnia silvae / Cocytusque sinu labens circumvenit atro*; Hor. *Od.* 2.14.17, *visendus ater flumine languido / Cocytus errans*; Sen. *Herc. f.* 686 *sup. cit.*; *Oed.* 583, *ipse pallentes deos / vidi inter umbras: ipse torpentes lacus, / noctemque veram* (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.323, *Cocyti stagna alta vides, Stygiamque paludem*). For *ignavus* applied to water in the sense of *parum mobilis*, cf. Luc. *Civ.* 5.442, *ignava . . . stagna tacentis* (MPU: *iacentis* ZGV, Housman) *aquae*; Apul. *Met.* 1.19, *lenis fluvius . . . ignavus ibat*; 4.6, *in modum stipati maris vel ignavi fluminis*; *OLD ignavus* 2b; *ThLL* 7.1.281.29–31; for other similar descriptions of quiet or stagnant waters, cf. Ov. *Ponto* 4.10.61, *stagno similis pigraeque paludi*; Luc. *Civ.* 2.641, *pigra palus*; 4.119, *pigras . . . paludes*; 5.435, *pigrius inmotis . . . paludibus* (with Barratt 142).

luridus Orcus: for the expression, cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.4.74–75, *partus fulmine / luridum missos ad Orcum*; cf. also Verg. *Ge.* 1.277, *pallidus Orcus*; Lygd. 1.28, *pallida Ditis aqua.*

luridus: "yellowish" (< *luror* = *summus pallor*). It is really an indeterminate colour between green and yellow "imprimis ad insana vel corrupta pertinens" (*ThLL* 7.2.1862.1–3). It is strictly used to describe the "bad colouring" of the ill and of corpses (cf. Ov. *Met.* 4.267, *luridus . . . pallor*; 11.654, *luridus, exanimi similis*), and also the ghostly pallor brought on by fear (cf. Apul. *Met.* 5.18, [*Psyche*] *tremens et exangui colore lurida*). In poetry, by metonymy (the cause-result relationship; cf. Lausberg, *Retórica literaria*, pp. 73–74), *luridus* is also applied to things causing paleness; cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.147, *lurida . . . aconita* (with Bömer 68); 14.198, *me luridus occupat horror.* Thus, following the models of metonymy known for *pallidus* as *pallida mors* (Hor. *Od.* 1.4.13) or *pallidus Orcus* (Verg. *Ge.* 1.277)—cf. comm. on Lygd. 1.28 *pallida*—, *luridus* is applied to anything relating to death or Hell: Hor. *Od.* 3.4.74–75

sup. cit. (the same phrase as in Lygdamus); Prop. 4.7.2, *lurida . . . umbra*; 11.8, *lurida porta Orci*; Ov. *Met.* 11.654, *luridus, exanimi similis*; 14.747, *luridaque arsuro portabat membra feretro* (with Bömer 225); Petr. *Satyr.* 124 vers. 257, *lurida Mortis imago*; Sil. 13.560, *nigrum pandens Mors lurida rictum*; *ThLL* 7.2.1863.6–11. In addition, the term *luridus* is attested from Plautus onward, above all in poetry, although it is not very frequent in the Augustan period: Verg. 0; Hor. 3; Tib. 0; Prop. 2; in Ovid only in *Met.* (7 times) and *Tr.* 5.7.16.

Orcus: in popular belief, Orcus is the spirit which represents death. Not too clearly distinguished from Hell itself, the name sometimes denotes (like Ἅιδες) the kingdom of the underworld itself, the dwelling-place of the dead. In the funeral paintings on Etruscan tombs, the spirit appears in the form of a bearded and hirsute giant. By sheer force it snatched men from their earthly existence and took them to the Underworld. This demon gradually became assimilated to the Hellenized gods, eventually becoming simply another name for Pluto or Dis Pater, although Orcus remained alive in popular speech (cf. the numerous proverbial expressions featuring *Orcus* in Otto, *Sprichwörter*, pp. 257–258 s.v *Orcus* 1–6 [1301–1306]), whereas the other two divinities belong to erudite mythology. Cf. Mackauer, *RE* 18.1 (1939) 908 ff.; Peter in Roscher III, pp. 940 ff.; Wissowa, *RuK*², p. 310; H. Wagenvoort, *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion* [Leiden: E. J. Brill 1956] 102–131; *OLD Orcus* 2; Grimal, *Mitología*, p. 389; F. Guirand, *Mitología general*, p. 282. For the etymology of *Orcus*, see H. Osthoff, "Griechische und lateinische Wortdeutungen", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 8 (1898) 54–56; A. Bezzenberger, "Etymologien", *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen* 26 (1901) 166; H. Wagenvoort, *op. cit.*; Walde-Hofmann, *LEW* II, p. 221; Radke 241; B. Lincoln, "The Hellhound", *JIES* 7 (1979) 283; for the relationship-confusion between Ὅρκος and *Orcus* (Pluto), see Mynors 64 *ad* Verg. *Ge.* 1.277.

As Fordyce (94–95 *ad* Catul. 3.14) adroitly points out, *Orcus* is "a solemn word in the epic language of Ennius, Lucretius, and Virgil: but its appearance in colloquial phrases in Plautus (e.g. *Pseud.* 795 'Orcus recipere ad se hunc noluit') and Petronius (45.9 'habebit stigmam nec illam nisi Orcus delebit'; cf. 46.7) shows that it was not unknown in popular speech". Well attested in Lucretius (3 times: 1.115; 5.996; 6.762), in Horace (10: *Od.* 1.28.10; 2.3.24; 18.30; 34; 3.4.75; 11.29; 27.50; 4.2.24; *Sat.* 2.5.49) and Virgil (10: *Aen.* 1.325; 2.2; 6.125; 562; 7.386; 435; 9.656; 10.632; 11.124; 12.806), as far as

the elegiac poets are concerned, *Orcus* never appears in Tibullus or Pseudo-Tibullus, and only once in Propertius (3.19.27) and Ovid (cf. *Met.* 14.116 [with Bömer 51]). After Ovid it is equally rare (cf. Luc. *Civ.* 6.715; Stat. *Theb.* 12.434; *CLE* 634.3 [= *CIL* 19189; add. p. 2746]; 1202.6; 1289.6; 1556.5; 1581.9).

IV

The sentiment inspiring the present elegy, by far the longest in the collection, is the combination of incredulity and despair that grips Lygdamus on hearing the first news of the treachery of his beloved Neaera.

The fictional-poetic framework chosen to give literary expression to the poet's highly emotional state of mind at such a delicate moment in the love affair is a detailed account of a revealing and prophetic dream: at dawn, the time of day when dreams are most true, the god Apollo in person, furnished with his lyre and therefore acting in his role as protector of poets, appears to the sleeping Lygdamus; acting as if he were a base informant, the god reveals the perfidy of Neaera, the woman responsible for all the poet's sleepless nights; then the very same god, now acting as an experienced *magister amoris*, attempts to raise his spirits, giving him practical advice on how to win back the love of his lady; finally, now in his role of *vates*, he prophesies the poet's marriage to Neaera.

Lygdamus places the account of this revealing and prophetic dream between a set of opening and closing distichs in which he informs us of his confused feelings, which swing between the incredulity—'it cannot be true!'—and despair—'let it not be true!'—with which he received the dream and its prophetic message. Thus, before he narrates the dream, he questions the veracity of such nocturnal visions (incredulity), at the same time invoking, as a precautionary measure, the aid of Lucina (despair); at the end of the poem, after the account of the vision, he again questions the truth of its prophetic content, on the grounds that the tenderness of Neaera makes any form of betrayal impossible (incredulity), although the elegy concludes with an invocation to the gods and the winds, calling for help to counter the dream (despair).

Thus, although from the narrative point of view the elegy is unequivocally constructed in two parts—account of the dream / reaction of the poet—what we are presented with structurally is undoubtedly a clear threefold division: A) about the dream (ll. 1–16); B) account of the dream (ll. 17–81); C) about the dream (ll. 82–96). This is fruit of the creative talent of the poet, who adroitly breaks the simple lineal cause-effect sequence (dream-reaction), and begins the elegy *in medias res*, exorcising at the outset the ill-omened dream he has had,

this giving rise to several general considerations on the veracity of dreams and the credulity of men, only then going on to give us an account of the dream itself, to conclude by questioning the truth of it on the basis of more personal arguments—the tenderness of Neaera—and attempting to exorcise it again. Consequently, the two-part structure that might so easily be expected is shattered, and instead, part of the sentiments and fears stirred up by the dream precede the account of the dream itself, preparing the way for it and infusing it with its emotive atmosphere; the second part, on the other hand, observes the strict chronological order of events and with it the elegy closes as it began, with an apotropaic invocation ('ring composition').

Somewhat disconcerting in the setting of the elegy as a whole is the prophecy by which Apollo promises Lygdamus a happy marriage to Neaera (ll. 79–80). Why, then, at the end of the elegy, does Lygdamus request that a god should replace the dream with a more favourable one or that it should be carried off by the wind, that is, that it should not come true, when the prophecy is favourable?

The dream motif is by no means out of place in the elegiac genre, although it is certainly true that in general the few elegiac dreams documented are, to follow the categorization of dream-criticism, oracular in nature: a deity or possibly a human, preferably deceased, appears in dreams and *aperte eventurum quid aut non eventurum, faciendum vitandumne denuntiat* (Macr. *Somn. Scip.* 1.3). A clear example of the divine variety of this type is precisely Lygd. 4; and for the human, Prop. 4.7 (appearance in a dream of the *umbra Cynthiae*). On the other hand, the allegorical type of dream is practically confined among the elegiac poets to the much-debated *Somnium Ovidianum* (Ov. *Am.* 3.5), in which Ovid has an allegorical dream about the infidelity and neglect of his beloved, and to Ov. *Her.* 19.193–202 (dream of Hero; dolphin = Leander), both of them allegorical dreams featuring animal fables.

The elegiac origin of the dream topos seems once again to date back to Hellenistic poetry (cf. Call. fr. 2 Pff. [with Sch. Flor.], the second prologue to the *Aetia*, in which Callimachus tells of his dream-encounter with the Muses on Mt. Helicon), although the literary treatment of the dream goes back to Homer in the allegorical animal-fable dream of Penelope in *Od.* 19.535–562 (geese = suitors; eagle = Odysseus). On the science of dream-criticism in Antiquity and its traces in classical literature, cf. D. Del Corno, "Ricerche sull'onirocritica greca", *RIL* 96 (Milano 1962) 334–366 (with bibliography); a list of

dreams in Greek literature can be found in R. G. A. van Lieshout, *Greeks on Dreams* (Utrecht 1980) 252–262; F. della Corte, "L'elegia del sogno (Ovid. *Am.* III.5)", in *Studi classici in onore di Q. Cataudella*, Catania 1972, pp. 319–330 (= *Opuscula IV*, Genova 1973, pp. 17–28).

The appearance of Apollo in dreams became common among the Augustan poets as an allegorical formula to express 'poetic consecration' (eg Prop. 3.3), and undoubtedly stems from the contamination of two passages from the double prologue to Callimachus' *Aetia*, namely: *fr.* 1.21 ff. Pff., where Apollo appears on the scene to give poetic instructions to the young Callimachus (a model imitated in Verg. *Ecl.* 6.3 ff.) and the above-mentioned *fr.* 2 Pff., where the Muses do likewise, although this time in a dream, according to the summary of the so-called *Scholium Florentinum*, following the original model established by Hesiod in *Theogeny* 22–34 and later imitated for the first time in Latin literature by Ennius (*fr.* 6 Vahlen). Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.31 ff. is the earliest Latin testimony of this contaminated version, although in this case it is Mars Quirinus who gives poetic advice in dreams. Other gods can also take on this role of oracular divinity, and for other literary ends: Ovid in *Rem.* 555 ff. transposes the scheme from the god of poetry, appearing in dreams to give poetic counsel, to the god of love (*Amor Lethaeus*) who gives instructions in dreams on amorous behaviour; in *Ponto* 3.3, Cupid, described physically with no stint of details (like Apollo in Lygd. 4.22 ff.), appears to Ovid in a dream and, expressing concern about the circumstances of his private life, consoles him and encourages him to bear with his exile. Undoubtedly, the appearance of Apollo to Lygdamus in a dream in connection with something other than poetic inspiration cannot be understood in isolation from the Ovidian treatment of the topos. Moreover, the prophetic aspect of the appearance of Apollo has an elegiac precedent in Prop. 4.6.27 ff., where Apollo, dressed in his warrior's robes, foretells to Augustus his victory at Actium; and especially in Ov. *Ars* 2.493–510, where Apollo appears to Ovid with all the attributes of a *vates* and gives the poet erotodidactic advice, two elements which make this passage of Ovid closely parallel to the treatment in Lygdamus.

R. Bürger ("Eine Elegie des Gallus", *Hermes* 38 [1903] 23–24), taking as his starting-point the similarity between Lygd. 4.57 and Verg. *Ecl.* 10.21 already pointed out by F. Marx ("Albius", *RE* 1.1.1326: «v. 4.57 erinnert an Gallus [Verg. *Ecl.* 10.21]»), suggests that the source for the intervention of Apollo in *Ecl.* 10.21–23 was

an account in Gallus' *Amores* of a vision and a revelation similar to that of Lygdamus, and that Lygdamus borrowed from Gallus both the dream and the prophecy, whereas Virgil retained only the latter; cf. also Büchner, "Lygdamus", p. 74. M. Parca ("The Position of Lygdamus in Augustan Poetry", *St. in Lat. Lit & Rom. Hist.* 4 [Bruxelles 1986] 471) suggests different conclusions: "First, if Gallus had experienced and written about an initiatic dream—of which there is no trace in extant sources—allusions to it would be more likely to occur in either *Ecl.* 6 or *Ecl.* 10, or in Propertius' program pieces, all of which contain key passages to defining the nature and role of Gallus' poetry, than in Lygdamus. Secondly, as Lygdamus seems to know Gallus through Virgil and Propertius, R. Bürger's remark that Apollo's words in *Ecl.* 10.21–23—the acknowledged model for Lygdamus—are adapted from Theocritus and not from Gallus can hardly be reconciled with his assumption that Lygdamus' adaption of Gallus' dream is more literal than that of Virgil".

Finally, it is worth mentioning a possible imitation of the tone of this elegy of Lygdamus in *CLE* 1109, an epitaph from the imperial period for a young man named M. Lucceius Nepos; its 46 lines describe the early-morning appearance in a dream of the dead man brought back to life. Peculiarities of scansion—such as *pulsabŏ* (l. 21), *timebŏ* (l. 22) and *errabŏ* (l. 24)—indicate that this epitaph was not composed before the 2nd half of the 1st c. AD.

1–16: in this passage the poet gives expression to the different sentiments and reflections arising from a bad dream he had, as he tells us, "last night": a) apotropaic invocation and rejection of the bad dream (ll. 1–4); b) considerations on the reality of dreams (ll. 5–10); c) invocation to Lucina against the bad dream (ll. 11–16). This very confused passage reflects the contradictory feelings of the poet, who composes the elegy as soon as he awakes from the dream, and is therefore still deeply affected by it; he is thus capable at the same time of denying, in his incredulity, the veracity of dreams, and of invoking, out of a sense of prudence, Lucina's protection against them, as a precautionary measure, or of trying to ward it off in his terror.

For the opinion of the ancients on the subject of dreams, see the counter arguments to those of Lygdamus in Cicero's *De divinatione* (1.39–70 and 2.58–71).

According to the *Book of Dreams* by Artemidorus Daldianus (2nd c. AD), "good" dreams are those in which the gods of Olympus are

seen (1.5), these deities aiding individuals of high standing when they appear to them in dreams (2.34); also "good" are those dreams in which the deity appears with all his attributes, as in the dream of Lygdamus (4.76). However, the laurel on Apollo's head indicates, among other things, the failure of one's expectations, in accordance with the myth concerning this shrub: Daphne, in rejecting the approaches of Apollo, disappointed the deity (2.25). In any case, the gods must be believed, because "falsehood is alien to a god" (2.69).

On Artemidorus Daldianus and dream-criticism in general, cf. A. H. M. Kessels, "Ancient Systems of Dream-Classification", *Mnemosyne* 22 (1969) 389–424; M. A. Vinagre Lobo, "Etapas de la literatura onirocrítica según los testimonios de Artemidoro Daldiano", *Habis* 22 (1991) 297–312; *id.*, *La literatura onirocrítica griega anterior a Artemidoro Daldiano*, unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Seville, 1993 (with complete bibliography on pp. 297–312).

1–4: a strikingly abrupt beginning, 'in medias res'. This rhetorical device, together with the build-up of elements characteristic of expressive-impressive syntax (exclamations, imperatives, vocatives), endows the passage with great *vis pathetica*. Note, too, the cross-references which appear in these two distichs: *meliora/pessima*, *vera/falsum*, *vani/fidem*. Such oppositions resurface in the course of the elegy. Basically, Lygdamus' sentiment here boils down to the notion that what is dreamt cannot be true; if, however, this is not the case, his plea is that either his dream should not come true or that it should not turn out to be as bad.

1 di meliora ferant: scil. *somnia*. A variant on the expression *di meliora faxint* (Pl. *Poen.* 1400; *Ps.* 315) or similar (cf. Ov. *Met.* 7.37, *di meliora velint*; cf. also the frequent *di melius faciant* [eg Pl. *Bacch.* 626[a]; *Cas.* 813]; *di melius faxint* [eg Pl. *Merc.* 285]; *di melius duint* [eg Ter. *Phorm.* 1005), more generally attested in its eliptic form *di meliora!*, "heaven forbid!" (cf. Cic. *Phil.* 8.9; Verg. *Ge.* 3.456; 513; Val.-Max. 4.3 ext.2; *OLD melior* 9c). In parallel, there is also frequent occurrence of the eliptic formula *di melius!* (cf. Ov. *Rem.* 439; *Met.* 9.497; Apul. *Met.* 3.13; *OLD melius* 7b), which must not be confused with *di melius* (*fecerunt* or similar), an exclamation of resignation (cf. Sen. *Ep.* 98.5; *OLD melius* 7c). In reality, the verb in this apotropaic exclamation can easily vary, depending on the demands of the context (cf. Pacuv. *Trag.* 112 R^2, *di monerint meliora atque amentiam averruncassint tuam!*); here it is obvious that *ferant* is called for in view of *tulit* (l. 2). On the trivial coining of these and other familiar for-

mulas to ward off evil, cf. Hofmann, *Latin familiar*, p. 43 (§ 39).

Moreover, it was fairly common practice in Antiquity to pronounce apotropaic words to ward off or exorcise ill-omened dreams; cf. in this context Ov. *Met.* 9.497, *di melius!*, where Byblis conjures away the nocturnal visions which link her incestuously to her brother Caunus. The similarities with this Byblis passage of Ovid do not end here: the mythological heroine also fears that the dream will come true—9.475, *quam noli rata sit* (scil. *noctis imago*)*!*; cf. Lygd. 4.1b, *nec sint mihi somnia vera*; and she too doubts, also with self-interested and optimistic incredulity, the truth of dreams (cf. Ov. *Met.* 9.495–496, *quod autem / somnia pondus habent? an habent et somnia pondus?*; cf. Lygd. 4.7–10). The passage of Ovid is also of use concerning the subtle distinction between *quies/somnus/somnia/visus/imago*. On the different types of dreams, cf. Macr. *Somn.* 1.3.

nec sint mihi somnia vera: Lygdamus desires "that the dream should not be true", that is, that it should not be realized. On this desire, cf. Ov. *Met.* 9.475 (*sup. cit.*). Some of the later mss. offer the reading *insomnia* (*mihi somnia* Z+), followed by the majority of the earlier editors and commentators (Muretus, Ach. Statius, Broukhusius, Vulpius, Heyne, Lachmann) down to Müller (1870); recently this alternative was reintroduced by Luck. This ingenious reading, in which *insomnia* must be taken in its sense of "dream, night vision" (ἐνύπνιον), and not "insomnia, wakefulness", is most solidly supported by Verg. *Aen.* 4.9, *quae me suspensam insomnia terrent!* and the classification of dreams by Macrobius (*Somn.* 1.3): ὄνειρος (*somnium*), ὅραμα (*visio*), χρηματισμός (*oraculum*), ἐνύπνιον (*insomnium*), φάντασμα (*visus*). However, modern editors, since Baehrens, have on the whole preferred the reading *mihi somnia*, which apart from the advantage of being supported by the vast majority of the mss., among them all the oldest, answers to the *somnia* of l. 7. *Insomnia* would appear to be the result of the paleographical confusion between *m̄ somnia* and *in somnia*, from a copy with *m somnia* (the *m* without the abbreviatory apostrophe).

somnia vera: "true dreams"; for the phrase, cf. Ov. *Her.* 19.196; in opposition to these, "false and baseless dreams" are described as *somnia vana* (eg Verg. *Aen.* 6.283–284; Ov. *Met.* 11.613–614, *varias imitantia formas / somnia vana*) or *inania* (eg Ov. *Her.* 9.39); cf. also Ov. *Met.* 11.626, *somnia, quae veras aequant imitantia formas*; *Ponto* 1.2.45, *somnia me terrent veros imitantia casus*.

2: the line presents some difficulties regarding textual transmission, since some mss. read *hesterna*, others *externa*, and the 'Cuiacianus

recentior' *extrema*. Traditionally, the reading followed by the earliest editors and commentators (Muretus, Ach. Statius) was *hesterna*. The reading *externa* makes no sense. It was Scaliger who reintroduced *extrema*, which enjoyed the favour of editors (Broukhusius, Vulpius, Heyne) for some time. In favour of the reading *extrema ... nocte* ("at the end of the night") is the ancient belief that prophetic dreams towards the end of the night, at daybreak, were the truest. In this respect, cf. Mosch. 2.5, (ἠώς) εὖτε καὶ ἀτρεκέων ποιμαίνεται ἔθνος ὀνείρων; Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.31–33, *atque ego cum Graecos facerem, natus mare citra, versiculos, vetuit me tali voce Quirinus, post mediam noctem visus, cum somnia vera: / "...*; Ov. *Her.* 19 (*Hero Leandro*) 195–196, *namque sub aurora, iam dormitante lucerna, somnia quo cerni tempore vera solent, /...*; Prop. 4.4.63–66; *CLE* 1109.7–9, *exacta prope nocte suos quum Lucifer ignes / spargeret et volucri roscidus iret equo / vidi ...*; Tert. *Anima* 48.1, *certiora et collatiora somniari affirmant sub* ***extremis noctibus*** (with Waszink [Amsterdam 1947] 507); Cypr. Gall. *Num.* 281–284; Philostr. *VA* 2.37. This reading is also supported by ll. 16–22, in which the moment of the dream is specified, just as night is receding and the sun is beginning to come up, that is *sub Aurora*.

Since Lachmann, however, modern editors and commentators, including Tränkle in his recent edition, have returned to the reading *hesterna*, as found in the earliest editions of Tibullus. The poetic phrase *hesterna ... nocte*, "last night", is widely attested in elegy, first in Tib. 2.1.12, *cui tulit hesterna gaudia nocte Venus* (with Murgatroyd 27; cf. also Prop. 2.29A.1, *hesterna, mea lux, cum potus nocte vagarer*; 3.8.1, *ad hesternas ... lucernas*; [Tib.] 3.18.5; Mart. 1.27.1; *ThLL* 6.3.2668.28 ff.). Moreover, in the same Ovidian epistle from Hero to Leander cited above in support of the reading *extrema*, a work which Lygdamus undoubtedly used as a model for the narrative of the early-morning vision, this same phrase appears: *nec minus* ***hesternae*** *confundor imagine* ***noctis*** (*Her.* 19.193). Plautus' *senex* Demipho also introduces his account of an allegorical animal-fable dream with the parallel expression *nocte proxima* (*Merc.* 227–228, *ego nocte hac quae praeteriit proxuma / in somnis egi satis*). On the other hand, the phrase *extrema ... nocte* is not attested anywhere else in Latin literature, in which the use of the adjective *extremus* appears to be restricted to time expressions indicating the end of lengthy periods, like the seasons of the year (eg *extrema hieme* in Cic. *Pomp.* 35) or months (eg *extremo ... mense* in Ov. *Fasti* 2.686). Moreover, *extrema ... nocte* has the disadvantage of adding nothing new with respect to ll. 17–22, and it seems more like the

learned conjecture of a humanist on the basis of reflection on these latter lines.

tulit hesterna . . . nocte: the same combination in the same part of the pentameter, and also in a relative clause, in Tib. 2.1.12 (*sup. cit.*).

1–2 somnia . . . pessima: the closest parallel is Tib. 2.6.37, *ne tibi neglecti mittant mala somnia manes*. In principle, *pessima* could be taken as agreeing with either *quae* (= *somnia*) or *quies*. The balanced expression *meliora ferant/tulit . . . pessima* suggests that the adjective should be understood as qualifying *somnia*. For the motif of bad dreams, cf. Hom. *Il.* 2.6 and 8 (οὖλος Ὄνειρος); A. *Pers.* 176 ff.; E. *IT* 42 ff.; Cic. *Div.* 2.119 ff.; Tib. 1.5.13–14; 2.6.37 ff.; Macr. *Somn.* 1.3.

3: the third word in the line raises serious difficulties, since the manuscript tradition is not unanimous: most of the mss. have *vani*, but another small but significant group of mss. gives the reading *vanum*. The earliest editors and commentators respected the majority tradition; however, *vani* (scil. *somnia* [l. 1] vel *somni*) is not completely satisfactory, because even though a 'constructio ad sensum' would not be impossible (cf. Munro *ad* Lucr. 1.352), it must be borne in mind: 1) that the masculine plural of l. 1 (*di*) makes it unlikely that Lygdamus would create such ambiguity; 2) that in l. 7 there is a further reference to *somnia*, not *somni*; 3) that until the late period there is no clear evidence for the use of *somnus* in the sense of "dream" (*somnium*). These considerations induced a number of earlier commentators (Scaliger, Broukhusius, Vulpius, Heyne, Hiller, Lachmann, Dissen) and, more recently, Tränkle 106–107 to follow the later mss. and write *vanum*, in agreement with *visum*: "away with you all, away with your false and empty vision"; for the phrase *vanum falsumque*, cf. Plin. *Nat.* 30.14, *quae omnia . . . princeps Nero vana falsaque comperit*. For the most part, however, modern editors feel the line lacks a vocative, a traditional component of the stereotyped formula of rejection *ite* (*i*) *procul* which serves to name the person or thing affected by the repudiation. One solution which enjoyed a certain measure of acceptance is the conjecture put forward by L. Bolle, and taken up by Cartault and Ponchont, *vani falsique . . . visus*, which requires, however, that *avertite* be taken intransitively. To get round this difficulty, G. Lee ("Tibulliana", *PCPhS* 20 [1974] 57) correctly proposes *ite procul, vani, falsumque avertite, visus*, "begone, unreal visions, and turn away your falsehood"; the noun *falsum*, though characteristic of prose, is occasionally found in poetry (cf. Lucr. 4.764, *nec possunt falsum veris convincere rebus*), particularly in Ovid (cf. *Am.* 3.3.11, *falsum iurare*; *Ars*

2.522, *te falsa videre puta!*; *Tr.* 3.10.35, *praemia falsi*). Other proposals, such as *(vanum est)* by Luck and *vanis* (ie *ad vanos*) by Baehrens, are ingenious ways round the problem, but somewhat implausible.

For the asyndetic expression *ite procul, ... avertite*, cf. Tib. 1.1.75–76, *vos, signa tubaeque, / ite procul, cupidis vulnera ferte viris.*

ite procul: the same hexameter-beginning is found in Tib. 1.1.76 *sup. cit.*; 2.4.15; Lygd. 6.7; Calp. 2.55. This is the well-known liturgical formula (πρόρρησις) to expel from the religious ceremony anyone who might pollute it by being profane or impure (see the commentary on Lygd. 6.7). The Augustan poets often reuse this liturgical formula, as here, in a figurative and non-religious sense; cf. Tib. 1.1.75–76 *sup. cit.*; 2.4.15, *ite procul, Musae, si non prodestis amanti* (with Murgatroyd 135); 20, *ite procul, Musae, si nihil ista valent*; Prop. 4.6.9, *ite procul, fraudes, alio sint aëre noxae*; Ov. *Am.* 2.1.3, *procul hinc, procul este, severi!*; *Her.* 21 (*Cydippe Acontio*).210, *es procul a nobis*; *Ars* 1.31, *este procul, vittae tenues* (with Hollis 38); 2.151; *Met.* 4.649; 6.362; 8.405; 10.300, *procul hinc, natae, procul este, parentes* (with Bömer 117); 341; 15.587; Mart. 11.6.6, *pallentes procul hinc abite curae* (with Kay 73); [Verg.] *Priap.* 8.1, *matronae procul hinc abite castae*; Stat. *Silv.* 2.7.131, *procul hinc abite Mortes*; Juv. 14.45, *procul, a procul inde puellae lenonum!* cf., in addition to Lygd. 6.7 (comm.), Lygd. 6.25; 52.

vani ... visus: for the combination, cf. Luc. *Civ.* 3.38, *quid ... vani terremur imagine visus?*; Suet. *Aug.* 91.1, *plurima* (scil. *somnia*) *et formidulosissima et vana et irrita. Visus* is the *vox propria* for a supernatural manifestation, especially one observed in a dream; cf. Vell. 2.57.2, *Calpurnia territa nocturno visu*; *OLD visus* 2b. *Vanus* frequently means "delusive" with reference to the phantoms and visions of the night; cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.6.9, *noctem simulacraque vana timebam*; *OLD vanus* 1b.

avertite: *vox propria* in apotropaic invocations, especially in connection with ill omens or misfortune; cf. Cic. *Mur.* 88, *quod Iuppiter omen avertat!*; *Phil.* 4.9, *o di immortales, avertite et detestamini, quaeso, hoc omen*; Verg. *Aen.* 3.265, *di, talem avertite casum* (cf. 9.78).

visus: Gr. φαντάσματα, *vox propria* for nocturnal visions.

4: the line has clearly been transmitted in a corrupt state. The reading of the mss., *in votis*, does not satisfy the editors; in fact, it only appears in the earliest editions (*Aldinae*, Muretus, Ach. Statius) and even then under suspicion of being corrupt. With the sole exception of Lachmann, the reading *in votis* never again reappears in the text but is relegated to the critical apparatus. Proposed emendations are extremely numerous and varied: *in somnis*, which appears in some of

the Italian *recentiores*, like the *codex Ferrarii*, as well as in the margin of a copy of the *editio Aldina 1515* in the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid (*R. 34671*); *in vanis*, proposed by Muretus in his commentary and accepted by Lenz (Levy) in his first edition of Tibullus of 1926; Ach. Statius proposed a single word, *inventis* vel *invitis*; Scaliger conjectured *in vobis*, understanding *me*, a reading which was accepted by some of the early editors and commentators (Broukhusius, Vulpius) until Heyne; Heinsius, *in veris*; Passeratius, *desinite iis vates* or *hinc vobis* (but *ad* Prop. 1.3.28 he accepts Muretus' conjecture); Baehrens, *in notis* (taking *notis* in the active sense: 'in eis qui vos norunt'). But the conjecture which enjoys the widest acceptance among modern editors is *in nobis* (Guyetus), a proposal adopted by Hiller, Postgate, Cartault, Lenz-Galinsky, Ponchont, Smith, Luck, Lee and others: "seek not in me a reputation for credibility". An ingenious conjecture which may well be the correct solution is *in ventis* (Thörnell, *Eranos* 32 [1934] 146): it not only points to the ethereal nature of night-time visions, but also connects with the elegiac motif that "*fides* is carried off in the wind" (cf. Lygd. 4.96 [comm.]; 6.27–28); in short, "to try to seek credit in the wind" is absurd, and a waste of time.

quaerere . . . fidem: for this expression in the sense of "to obtain credibility", cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.612, *haec tibi quaeratur qualibet arte fides.*

desinite . . . quaerere velle: for the expression of prohibition by *desine* + infinitive, which is frequent in poetry, and for the phrase *desinite . . . velle*, see Lygd. 4.80 *desine velle* (comm.); for other equally poetic formulas of prohibition, see Lygd. 5.6 *parce nocere* (comm.).

5–10: thoughts concerning the veracity of prophetic dreams: 'in oraculis et in extispiciis veritas inest, non in somniis'. Lygdamus opposes on the one hand (ll. 5–6) the oracles of the gods (l. 5) and the *extispicium* or inspection of the entrails (*exta*) of sacrificed animals (l. 6), as trustworthy procedures for correctly predicting the future (*vera monent*), and on the other the random nocturnal visions which deceive the credulous minds of men (ll. 7–10).

5–6: behind this distich lie two *loci Tibulliani*: 1.8.3–4, *nec mihi sunt sortes nec conscia fibra deorum, / praecinit eventus nec mihi cantus avis*, and 2.1.25–26, *eventura precor: viden ut felicibus extis / significet placidos nuntia fibra deos?*. As regards the text, there are in principle no problems of transmission—the mss. are unanimous (*divi vera monent venturae nuntia sortis*)—though there are serious discrepancies in the punctuation of the hexameter as it has come down to us. Most editors and commentators, both early and modern, interpret the 2nd half of the

hexameter (*venturae nuntia sortis*) as being in proleptic apposition to the *exta* of the pentameter: the punctuation would then be strong, coinciding with the penthemimer. Used in support of this apposition to *exta* is Tib. 2.1.25–26 *sup. cit.* Cyllenius, on the other hand, does not punctuate at the penthemimer, but reads *divi vera monent venturae nuntia sortis;/*, with heavy punctuation at the end of the hexameter. Only Lee follows this interpretation of the Veronese scholar, although he introduces light punctuation at the penthemimer and has the 2nd half of the line in apposition to the *vera* of the 1st half: *divi vera monent, venturae nuntia sortis; / . . .* For my part, I consider all three possibilities unsatisfactory. The traditional interpretation involves an awkward enjambement and a no less unwieldy tmesis of the apposition in relation to *exta*, not to mention the imbalance represented by the very different length of the two members (*divi* and *exta*); Cyllenius' proposal also introduces a principle of inequality, since the *vera monent* is taken differently in the two lines: in the hexameter *vera* qualifies *nuntia*, the real object of *monent*; in the pentameter *vera* is substantivized and itself constitutes the object of *monent*; it would be possible to understand *nuntia*, but *vera monenti* (l. 11) makes it very clear that this is not the right way to approach the problem (cf. also *vera canunt* in l. 77). Lee's proposal, although it seems to me to be the best, again does not fit in with the argument: if the gods presage the truth, then the dreams in which the gods appear, like that of Apollo, will also be true; in fact, the opposition Lygdamus wants to establish is between the falsehood of visions in sleep (even if they are visions of gods) and the veracity of the oracles and the *extispicium*; besides, such a general statement as *divi vera monent* makes no sense, since not all the gods can prophesy (in fact, strictly only Apollo, Jupiter and Bacchus have this power). In my view, the hexameter has been transmitted in a deformed state from so early on that the mss. all agree in the error of transmission. My restoration is *divae vera monent, venturi nuntia, sortes*, assuming that the copyist misinterpreted the archaizing nominative plural form *sortis* ("oracles") as a genitive singular ("chance", "future"), which in turn would force the changes of *venturi* to *venturae*, now made to agree with *sortis* (gen.), and, in order to provide the sentence with a new subject, of *divae* to *divi* (notwithstanding the *di* of l. 1). For the reference in the same context to oracles and the *extispicium*, cf. Tib. 1.8.3–4 *sup. cit.*, the assumed model for this passage.

vera monent: for the expression, cf. Tib. 2.4.51; Ov. *Met.* 13.775;

Stat. *Theb.* 8.333–334, *caeloque et vera monentibus aris concilies* (*me, Amphiaraë*); Lygd. 4.11, *vera monenti.*

monent: the verb *monere* belongs, as *vox propria*, to the field of prediction of the future inspired by a deity; cf. eg Verg. *Ecl.* 9.15; *Aen.* 3.712; 7.41, *tu vatem, tu, diva, mone*; Liv. 26.19.4; Tib. 1.6.50 (of the great priestess of *Bellona*), *et canit eventus, quos dea magna monet*; *ThLL* 8.1409.24 ff.; 74 ff.; 1412.27 ff.; 1413.18 ff. In this use *monere* can take a neuter plural adjective in order to indicate the nature—happy or dire, true or false—or else the number of the predictions or warnings; cf. Pacuv. Trag. 112, *di monerint meliora!*; Lucil. 653; Verg. *Aen.* 3.712, *vates . . ., cum multa horrenda moneret*; Ov. *Her.* 20.108, *falsa monere*; *Ars* 3.353, *parva monere pudet*; *Met.* 10.427, *scit se non falsa moneri*; *Fasti* 6.766, *per volucres aequos multa monere deos*; *vera monere* in preceding n.; in prose only in Sall. *Cat.* 58.3, *pauca monerem*; *ThLL* 8.1408.8–16.

5 nuntia: for the use of this term in apposition, cf. Ov. *Met.* 5.549, *foedaque fit volucris, venturi nuntia luctus.*

venturi: for *venturum* as a noun ("the future"), cf. Ov. *Met.* 6.157, *nam sata Tiresias, venturi praescia, Manto*; 9.418–419, *haec ubi faticano venturi praescia dixit / ore Themis.* The nominalization of a neuter future participle is attested from Cicero on; cf. Cic. *Div.* 1.29, *eventura* (= Ov. *Ponto* 3.4.113; Lygd. 4.48; cf. Ov. *Tr.* 1.9.41, *hoc eventurum*); Sall. *Iug.* 1.5, *profutura*; Ov. *Met.* 5.146, *ventura* (with Bömer 261); Hofmann-Szantyr 157 (§ 91 c).

6 tuscis . . . viris: periphrasis for *haruspicibus*. The *haruspices* were diviners, originally from Etruria, whose numbers in Rome increased considerably after the Second Punic War, when they even formed an *ordo haruspicum LX*, which was hierarchically organized and provided with priestly books. Although the *haruspices* were responsible for interpreting three types of phenomena, *exta*, *monstra* (*ostenta, portenta, prodigia*) and *fulgura* (cf. Cic. *Div.* 1.12; 2.26), they owed their high standing mainly to the *extispicium*, a special procedure involving the minute and detailed examination of the entrails (*exta*) of sacrificial victims—especially the liver (hepatoscopy) and gall-bladder of sheep (see following n.)—in which they "read" the future, in accordance with pre-established rules concerning the size, shape, colour and markings of the vital organs examined. This special skill is the one mentioned here by Lygdamus, with the result that some scholars would see in this strange allusion to the *disciplina Tusca* (or *Etrusca*) a clear sign of the Etruscan origins of the poet himself. On the *extispicium* (*exta inspicere* from Pl. *Aul.* 565; also *exta consulere* from Verg. *Aen.* 4.64),

cf. A. *Pr.* 493 ff.; Cic. *Div.* 1.131; 2.28, 32; Ov. *Met.* 7.600; 15.136–137 (with Bömer 293); 15.575–580; 795 (with Bömer 467); Paul. Fest. 100 M. (= 89 L.); Serv. Auct. *Aen.* 4.64; C. Thulin, *Die Etrusk. Disciplin,* 2 (1906); *id.*, "*Haruspices*", *RE* 7.2 (1912) 2454 (§ 28); Pease 94–98 *ad* Cic. *Div.* 1.16; W. R. Halliday, *Greek Divination* (Chicago 1967 [= 1913]) 187 ff.; A. S. Pease, *OCD* 489 s.v. *Haruspices.*

exta: a word of dubious etymology, probably originating as a result of haplology from **exsecta* (< *exseco*), according to Walde-Hofmann, *LEW* (1910²) 263 s.v.; cf. also Paul. Fest. p. 78 M., *exta dicta, quod ea dis prosecantur quae maxime extant, eminentque* (*prominentque* in *ThLL* 5.2.1962.37–38). Apart from the liver (*iecur*), the organ of adivination par excellence (cf. Tib. 1.8.3, *conscia fibra deorum*; 2.1.26, *nuntia fibra*; Prop. 4.1.104, *fibra locuta deos*) and the oldest (cf. Sch. *ad* Ar. *Vesp.* 831, ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ [= the priests] πρῶτον τὸ ἧπαρ ἐπισκοποῦνται, εἶτα σπλάγχνα ξαὶ τὰ λοιπά), the *exta* most widely used for religious and prophetic purposes were the gall-bladder (*fel*), the lungs (*pulmo*), the mesentery (*omentum*) and also, from the times of Pyrrhus (cf. Plin. *Nat.* 11.186), the heart (*cor*). While the *exta* were offered up to the gods, the *viscera*, that is, the flesh of the sacrificed animal, were devoured by those making the offering (cf. Ov. *Met.* 12.150–157; Serv. *Aen.* 6.253). Note that Lygdamus here does not use the poetic term for *exta* or *iecur*, namely *fibra*; cf. the examples cited above; C. Thulin, *Die etrusk. Disciplin,* 2 (1906) 42–44; *id.*, "Haruspices", *RE* 7.2 (1912) 2453; Marquardt-Wissowa, *RStV* III, p. 181; Bömer 352 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 7.600.

probata: an unusual verb in the field of adivination, which may be replacing the expected technical term *prōsēcta* (eg Ov. *Met.* 12.152), which is metrically impossible in the 5th foot of the hexameter (for the etymological combination *exta prosecare*, cf. Cato *Agr.* 134.4, *ubi exta prosecta erunt*; Pl. *Poen.* 456, *abii illim ilico iratus, votui exta prosicarier*, Liv. 5.21.8, *qui eius hostiae exta prosecuisset*; Suet. *Aug.* 1). Perhaps *probata* is no more than a gloss (*probăta*, Gr. πρόβατα = sheep, the favourite sacrificial animal) wrongly taken as *probāta* by a copyist who introduced it into the text in place of the original verbal participle, perhaps *litata*, another verb belonging to the technical language of sacrifices; cf. Prop. 4.1.24, *pastor . . . exta litabat ovis*; R. Schilling, "L'originalité du vocabulaire religieux latin", *Rites, cultes, dieux de Rome,* Paris 1979, p. 34 (= *RBPh* 49 [1971] 35).

7–8: nocturnal visions are no more than empty appearances, occurring by chance during sleep, which trick the credulous and fearful minds of men. On the falseness of dreams, cf. Lucr. 5.62, *simulacra*

solere in somnis fallere mentem. The distich does not seem to present any textual problems; the manuscript tradition is unanimous and has been accepted without alteration by editors of all periods; however, the syntax is certainly rather awkward, making it necessary to look for the direct object of *ludunt* in the pentameter (*pavidas mentes*) and forcing the meaning of *iubent*: "<dreams> ... lead impressionable spirits to nurture false fears".

7 somnia ... temeraria: "dreams arising by chance"; *temerarius* here has the sense of "fortuitous" as in Ov. *Met.* 2.616, *temeraria tela* (= 'tela temere missa'); *Ponto* 3.6.27, *Iuppiter in multos temeraria fulmina torquet*; cf. Lygd. 6.27, *venti temeraria vota ... diripienda ferant*, where *temerarius* is used, on the contrary, in the sense of "rash, unthinking, daring". *Temerarius* does not seem to be a highflown poetic term; apart from these two examples from Lygdamus, it is extensively used only in Ov. (33 times, 20 of them in *Met.-Fasti*); once in Prop. (2.8.13, the only evidence of its poetic use before Ovid); never in Verg., Hor., Tib.; it appears early on in comedy, Cic., Caes., *Bell. Alex.*, Nep. and Vitr.

ludunt: the use of the verb *ludere* in the sense of "to deceive" (= *fallere*) is not infrequent in the context of dreams. Cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.27.38–42, *vigilansne ploro / turpe commissum an vitiis carentem / ludit imago / vana quae porta fugiens eburna somnium ducit?*; Petr. *Satyr.* 128.6 vers. 1, *nocte soporifera veluti cum somnia ludunt / errantes oculos*; Sen. *Dial.* 1.6.3, *animos inanes velut longo fallacique somnio lusi.* Note, however, that in Cic. *Div.* 2.52 the verb *ludere* is applied to the *extispicium*: *hoc civili bello ... quam multa* (scil. *haruspicum responsa*) *luserunt!*

fallaci ... nocte: the adjective *fallaci* should strictly agree with *somnia*; cf. Catul. 64.56, *fallaci ... somno*; Sen. *Dial.* 1.6.3, *fallacique somnio.* On the falseness of dreams Quintilian states: *somniorum et superstitionum colores ipsa iam fallacitate auctoritatem perdiderunt* (*Inst.* 4.2.94).

8 pavidas mentes: this phrase is to be taken as depending ἀπὸ κοινοῦ both on *ludunt* (l. 7) and on *iubent* (l. 8). For the phrase, cf. Lucr. 6.51, *mortales, pavidis cum pendent mentibus*; Petr. *Satyr.* 89 l. 17; Sen. *Dial.* 3.20.5, *mens pavidissima*; *Phaed.* 1082; Amm. 20.3.1; 20.11.25; *ThLL* 10.815.51–54. In the context of dreams, cf. Liv. 1.58.3, *cum pavida ex somno mulier ... mortem imminentem videret.* In the present passage, however, the adjective *pavidas* seems to be used in the sense of "easily frightened by nature", as applied to hind, hares or sheep (cf. *OLD pavidus* 2).

9: for the first half of the hexameter, which is completely disfigured by the transmission and one of the 'loci desperati' of the *Corpus*

Tibullianum offering the greatest number of variants, no completely satisfactory reading has yet been found, even though numerous emendations have been proposed in all periods. The 'emendationes' put forward for the impossible reading *natum maturas* of the best complete mss. can, on the whole, be divided into two groups: a) those which assume that the corrupt passage refers to *hominum genus*; b) those referring, on the other hand, to *omina*. Of the former, *natum in curas* is the reading that has enjoyed widest acceptance since Muretus rescued it "ex vetere libro" and the one followed by most modern authors (Heyne, Lachmann, Cartault, Lenz, Luck); less successful was *vanum metuens* (*eds. Romana 1475, Aldinae 1502 et 1515*, Ach. Statius). Within the latter group, certain support was shown for *vanum ventura* (Broukhusius, Vulpius); working from this, Baehrens conjectured *vanum eventura*. Muretus' capricious emendation of the initial *et* to *at* was fortunately not followed by other editors. In the second half of the hexameter some mss. read *omina*, and others an impossible *omnia* which was incomprehensibly mantained by Muretus and Ach. Statius.

natum in curas: the wretched condition of mortals is a topos from Homer on; cf. Hom. *Il.* 13.569, ὀϊζυροῖσι βροτοῖσι; 22.31, δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσι; Verg. *Ge.* 1.237, *mortalibus aegris*; 3.66, *miseris mortalibus*.

hominum genus: ie *homines*. Exactly the same periphrasis is found in Sil. 15.88.

omina noctis: the designation of dreams as *omina* is only found in Ov. *Her.* 9.39–40, *me pecudum fibrae simulacraque inania somni ominaque arcana nocte petita movent*, and Luc. *Civ.* 7.22. For the expression *omina noctis*, cf. Prop. 4.4.23, **omina Lunae/**, "dreadful dreams caused by Hecate" (with Fedeli 141); *ThLL* 9.2.577.75.

10: for the formulation of the pentameter as a whole, cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.23.19–20, *mollivit aversos Penates / farre pio et saliente mica*, the obvious model, from which Lygdamus takes the image of salt jumping when thrown onto the flames. Lygdamus undoubtedly altered the line-ending in search of the alliteration *saliente sale*, which Horace deliberately avoided with *mica*, as did Ovid in *Fasti* 4.409, *farra deae, micaeque licet salientis honorem / detis.*

For the conjoint allusion to *far* and *sal*, cf. also Ov. *Fasti* 1.128, *Iano sacerdos imponit . . . farra . . . mixta sale*; 338, *deos homini quod conciliare valeret far erat et . . . mica salis*; 3.248, *vinaque dat tepidis farraque salsa focis*; Juv. 6.386.

farre pio: a reference to *mola salsa* (cf. Serv. *Ecl.* 8.82, *far enim pium, id est mola casta, salsa*), a type of cake made of toasted barley

flour mixed with salt, which in the sacrificial ritual (cf. Ov. *Met.* 15.133–134) was sprinkled on the forehead and between the horns of the animal to be killed—hence *immolare*; cf. Suet. *Frg.* 176 (p. 275 Re.); Paul. Fest. p. 110 M.—, as well as on the altar and fire on which the beast was to be sacrificed and subsequently burnt; cf. Varro *Lat.* 5.104, *ex mola, id est ex sale et farre molito*; Fest. p. 141 M., *mola . . . vocatur far tostum et sale sparsum, quod eo molito hostiae aspergantur*, Plin. *Nat.* 12.83; 18.7; 31.89, *maxime tamen in sacris intellegitur auctoritas, quando nulla conficiuntur sine mola salsa*; Val.-Max. 2.5.5, *in sacrificiis mola quae vocatur ex farre et sale constat; exta farre sparguntur*, Porph. *Od.* 3.23.20; Serv. *Aen.* 2.133; 5.745; Arn. 7.26; *ThLL* 6.1.278.37–75; cf. also Pease 429–430 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 4.517 (with numerous *loci*); Bömer 293 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 15.134; 23 *ad* Ov. *Fasti* 1.128. According to tradition, its use in sacrifices was traditionally prescribed by Numa (cf. Plin. *Nat.* 18.7). Serv. *Ecl.* 8.82 describes the preparation of the *mola* by the Vestal Virgins. The present passage specifically deals with expiatory sacrifices, common among the Romans to conjure away dreams announcing misfortune, which were generally offered by those who had had the dreams or else those affected by such ill-omens. The use of *mola salsa* in these sacrifices together with other offerings is well attested; cf. Pl. *Amph.* 738–740, *somnium narrat tibi. / sed, mulier, postquam experrecta es, te prodigiali Iovi / aut mola salsa hodie aut ture comprecatam oportuit*; Tib. 1.5.13–14, *ipse procuravi, ne possent saeva nocere somnia, ter sancta* (*salsa* Muretus) *deveneranda mola* (with Smith 294; Murgatroyd 165–166); Mart. 7.54.1–8, *semper mane mihi de me mera somnia narras, / quae moveant animum sollicitentque meum. / iam prior ad faecem, sed et haec vindemia venit, / exorat noctes dum mihi saga tuas; / consumpsi* **salsasque molas** *et turis acervos; decrevere greges, dum cadit agna frequens; / non porcus, non chortis aves, non ova supersunt. aut vigila aut dormi, Nasidiane, tibi.* Another common method in the case of ill-omened dreams was morning cleansing with running water (cf. Prop. 4.4.24; Verg. *Aen.* 8.82; Val.-Flac. 5.332; Stat. *Theb.* 9.573; Pers. 2.16; Juv. 6.522; *i.a.*).

For the phrase *farre pio*, in addition to Hor. *Od.* 3.23.19–20 (*sup. cit.*), cf. Verg. *Aen.* 5.745, also at the beginning of a line, though in this case a hexameter. For the transferal or enallage of the epithet, cf. Catul. 68.79, *pium . . . cruorem* (ie the blood of a properly carried-out sacrifice); Verg. *Aen.* 4.637, *pia vitta*; Ov. *Her.* 21.7, *pia tura*; Lygd. 2.16, *pias . . . manus* (comm.).

placant: ie 'expiant hominum genus (= homines) omina noctis', "men ward off evil night-time omens". Note that the verb appears in

the plural (*placant*), although grammatically the subject is singular in number (*genus*). It is therefore a 'constructio ad sensum': since the subject is represented by a singular collective noun, the verb has been construed in the plural, the sense of the term prevailing in the mind of the poet over its grammatical structure. The construction was undoubtedly facilitated by the fact that the singular collective noun was determined by a genitive plural (*hominum genus*); cf. Kühner-Stegmann II.1.22; Hofmann-Szantyr 436–437 (§ 233 I Aa); Ernout-Thomas 139–140 (§ 166); Bassols II.59 (§ 57 c).

Also striking is the unusual phrase *omina placare*, instead of the expected *expiare* (or *piare*, or similar; cf. Ov. *Her.* 19.194, *est sacris illa* [scil. *imago noctis*] *piata meis*). To understand this verbal confusion we must take as our starting-point—as Tränkle 108 rightly proposes—the passage of Horace from which Lygdamus took his inspiration: *mollivit aversos Penates / farre pio et saliente mica* (*Od.* 3.23.19–20). Lygdamus' borrowing of the Horatian formula *farre pio et saliente mica* has led to the ousting of the expression strictly required to ward off the evil omen by the formula of placation (of a god, that is, of his wrath). What we have here is therefore a faulty adaptation of the model. Nevertheless, Lygdamus might be regarded as having the gods in mind in this passage, because it is they who are regarded as sending the omens at night (cf. Pl. *Merc.* 225–226, *miris modis dii ludos faciunt hominibus, / mirisque exemplis omina in somnis danunt*).

11–16: Lygdamus, having refused to believe in the omens of the night, now prudently invokes the aid of Lucina against them, an aid he claims to deserve, in that he has not offended the gods, either in word or in deed. The concessive expression implied thereby in the train of thought set in motion is highlighted at the beginning of the passage by the adversative expression *et tamen*, which at the beginning of the period usually has the meaning "in spite of everything, in spite of what has been said so far", thus establishing a copulative relationship, concessive in tone, with the preceding clause, absolutely equivalent to *quamquam . . . tamen* (cf. Cic. *Att.* 9.13.8, *Pompeius N. Magium de pace misit et tamen oppugnatur*; Mart. 1.77.1 ff., *pulchre valet Charinus et tamen pallet. / parce bibit Charinus et tamen pallet. / . . .*; Kühner-Stegmann II.2.98; Hofmann-Szantyr 495–497 (§ 267); Ernout-Thomas 450 (§ 431) and 453 (§ 435); Bassols II.109–110 [§ 113]).

11–12: among the earlier commentators, the whole textual discussion concerning this distich was centered on the preference for the reading *moneri* (Ach. Statius, Broukhusius, Vulpius) or *monenti* (Muretus,

Heyne), the only textual discrepancy in the manuscript tradition. *Illi* was considered to pick up the *hominum* of l. 9. However, Dissen 346 states that it is clear that the subject of *volent* is *homines*, and he therefore emends *illi* to a neuter *illis* which, as he sees it, picks up the *exta* of l. 6. Helm, on the other hand, makes this *illis* refer to the *omina noctis* of l. 9. Postgate expresses the view that the future *volent* has no place here and correctly conjectures *solent*. Tränkle 109–110 supports the emendations to the distich proposed by Dissen and Postgate (*illis vera moneri . . . solent*), and considers the phrase *illis vera moneri* to be unchallengeable, referring to Cic. *Nat.* 2.166, *multa ostentis, multa extis admonemur*, and Ov. *Met.* 10.427, *virgo scit se non falsa moneri/*. In my opinion, the content of the distributive disjunction *sive . . . sive*, introduced by *utcumque est*, given the context, can only refer to the truth or falseness of dreams: "be the omens of the night true or false, do you, Lucina, ensure that this one I have had tonight is not fulfilled". Consequently, the correct reading in my view is *sive illi vera monenti* (ie *somno*), / *mendaci somno credere sive solent*: "whether they (= men) tend to give credit to a dream that foretells the truth or to one that is false, . . .". That is, the disjunction is between the terms qualifying the dream, true (*vera monenti*) or false (*mendaci*).

sive . . . sive: "whether . . .or". This combination of disjunctive conditional conjunctions, infrequent in the archaic period but widespread in the classical, always introduces two contrary and mutually-exclusive hypotheses; in the classical period the construction is with the indicative, although in the Imperial period the subjunctive also appears; cf. Cic. *Att* 12.12.2, *sive habes aliquid, sive nihil habes, scribe tamen aliquid*; Kühner-Stegmann 2.2.436; Hofmann-Szantyr 503–504 (§ 272) and 521–522 (§ 285 C); Ernout-Thomas 386 (§ 378.4); Bassols II.282 (§ 265.4).

12 mendaci . . . credere . . . solent: for the expression, cf. Cic. *Div.* 2.146, *cum mendaci homini ne verum quidem dicenti credere soleamus.*

mendaci somno: the combination is only attested in Ov. *Her.* 13.105, *aucupor in lecto mendaces caelibe somnos* (cf. Fletcher 49); for *mendax* 'de somnis et visis', cf. *ThLL* 8.704.65–69.

credere: intr., "to believe, to trust"; cf. Acc. *Trag.* 169, *nihil credo auguribus.*

13–14: invocation of the goddess Lucina. This is the only known occurrence of an invocation to this goddess in connection with a dream. Lucina is strictly the goddess presiding over births, so called "because she provides the light at the moment of birth" (Capel. 2.149);

from early on she was identified with Juno, who was worshipped on such occasions under the title of Juno Lucina (Pl. *Aul.* 692). Later, due to Greek influence, Juno Lucina is identified with Diana (cf. Catul. 34.13–14, *tu* [scil. *Diana*] *Lucina dolentibus / Iuno dicta puerperis*); for the identification of *Lucina* with Diana, see Pease 728–729 *ad* Cic. *Nat.* 2.68; Bömer 114 *ad* Ov. *Fasti* 2.435; 158 *ad* 3.255; Norden, *Agnostos Theos* 151. According to Cicero (*Nat.* 2.68), the assimilation can be explained by the relationship observed from an early period between the moon and pregnancy; and it should not be forgotten that one of the three facets of Diana Triformis or Tergemina—namely, Selene in the heavens, Artemis on earth, Hecate (or Diana Trivia = Ἄρτεμις Τριοδῖτις) in the underworld; cf. J. Heckenbach, "Hekate", *RE* 7.2 (1912) 2782—was the fact that she was considered a personification of the moon (Ἄρτεμις Εἰλείθυια), just as her brother Apollo was a parallel personification of the sun (cf. ll. 21 *Phoebus* [comm.]; 29 *Latonia Luna* [comm.]). However, in present context cannot be understood as an invocation to such a goddess of birth. As a result, some commentators maintain it is Juno Lucina who is being called upon here, as the goddess assimilated to Diana, who in turn, as Diana Trivia, had been assimilated in the Greek world to the chthonic Hecate (cf. Bömer 24 *ad* Ov. *Fasti* 1.141), who even then was considered an underworld goddess presiding over magic and charms, connected with the world of the shades (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.511 ff. [with n. by Pease 419–420]). Moreover, in the Greek world too, ghostly apparitions and distressing dreams had already been related to Hecate, who was regarded as the goddess who sent out or frustrated dreams (cf. E. *Hel.* 569–570). However, there is no trace whatsoever of the latter in Roman literature, with the exception of Stat. *Theb.* 9.604 ff. In view of such shaky foundations it is not surprising that other commentators would rather believe that Lygdamus here is referring to Lucina in her capacity—given her identification with Juno—of *genialis tori . . . custos* in the sense of Sen. *Med.* 1–2. The content of the prophetic dream—a conjugal dispute—fits in well with this interpretation. Detractors, however, argue (Tränkle 110) that the evocative image of birth and the newly-born which unavoidably accompanies the mere mention of the name of Lucina is sufficient to demolish this theory. Others, since Broukhusius, believe that, in naming Lucina, Lygdamus is invoking a putative goddess of the light or the dawn, whose appearance was supposed to ward off the terrors of the night (*noctis . . . timores*); this theory has recently been subscribed to by

G. Luck, *GGA* 246 (1994) 77: «Lucina ist... hier durch gelehrte Spielerei zur Göttin des Tageslichts (*lux*) geworden». But although the Romans were aware of the etymological relationship between *lux* (and *Luna*) and *Lucina* (cf. Varro *Lat.* 5.69; Cic. *Nat.* 2.68, *luna a lucendo nominata est. eadem est enim Lucina*; Ov. *Fasti* 2.450; 3.255; 6.39–40; Plin. *Nat.* 16.44; Porph. *Od.* 3.22.2–3; Paul. Fest. 304 M.; Isid. *Orig.* 3.71.2, *luna dicta quasi Lucina, ablata media syllaba*; 8.11.57; Maltby, *LALE*, p. 348), yet in all of Roman literature Lucina never actually appears as goddess of the dawn. It would certainly be an *unicum*; cf. K. Latte, "Lucina", *RE* 13.2 (1927) 1648–1651; Radke 188–189. Herrmann, for his part, solves the problem by emending *Lucina* to *Lucifer*.

13 efficiat: the construction of *efficere* and similar verbs (*facere, reddere*) with two accusatives, one the direct object (*timores*), the other predicative (*vanos*), was already common in classical Latin; cf. Hofmann-Szantyr 43 (§ 48 b).

noctis... timores: for the expression, cf. S. *El.* 412, δεῖμα νύκτερον; A.R. 4.685, δείματα νεξίων ὀνείρων; Sen. *Thy.* 838–840, *non Phoebeis / obvia flammis demet nocti / Luna timores*; cf. also Prop. 1.3.28, *ne qua tibi insolitos portarent visa* (scil. *nocturna*) *timores.*

vanos... timores: cf. Ov. *Her.* 16.344, *vanos... metus*; cf. also Hor. *Od.* 1.23.3–4, *vanu... metu*; Cic. *Cael.* 36, *propter... nocturnos quosdam inanis metus*; Verg. *Ge.* 3.79, *nec vanos horret strepitus*; Sen. *Oed.* 700–701, *qui pavet vanos metus, / veros meretur.*

14–16: a similar line of thought lying in relating personal misfortune to supposed divine punishment for impious words or deeds can be detected in Tib. 1.2.81–88: Tibullus wonders whether his ill fortune in love—Delia's husband has mounted fierce guard on her—is a punishment from Venus for some offence he has committed against her or some other crime against the gods, and should it be so, he declares himself willing to do penance:

Num Veneris magnae violavi numina verbo,
et mea nunc poenas impia lingua luit?
Num feror incestus sedes adiisse deorum
sertaque de sanctis deripuisse focis?
Non ego, si merui, dubitem procumbere templis
et dare sacratis oscula liminibus,
non ego tellurem genibus perrepere supplex
et miserum sancto tundere poste caput.

Although in the application of the misfortune-divine punishment-impiety scheme the two poets are pursuing very different objectives—

Tibullus to exteriorize the feeling of impotence of "what did I do to deserve this?", Lygdamus to stress his own innocence: he has done nothing to justify divine punishment, because of which there is no allusion, as there is in Tibullus, to penitence, since the crime has been denied—nevertheless, the dependence of Lygdamus on this passage of Tibullus is clear in certain linguistic echoes: *impia lingua* (in the same place in the pentameter), *immeritum* ≈ *si merui* and *magnos . . . deos* ≈ *magnae Veneris* (cf. *deorum* in l. 83). The conditional conjunction *si* is yet another sign of the influence of the passage of Tibullus and its extremely poor adaptation in a different context: the conditional has no place in Lygdamus, since if we take the poet to be conditioning Lucina's will to his pious behaviour, what are we to do with *immeritum*?. If we keep it, the innocence of Lygdamus is a fact, and the conditional therefore makes no sense at all. Rather, the *si*-clause should be taken as subordinate to the participle *immeritum*, as an addendum explaining the reason for his innocence. The same scheme of *immeritum*-absence of crime is used again by Lygdamus in 5.6–14 (comm.) when he calls on a goddess for help: *immerito iuveni parce, nocere, dea. / Non ego . . . / nec . . .*; cf. also *impia . . . ora* (l. 14).

The mood of these lines is a faithful reflection of the idea of sin and punishment in Antiquity. Misfortune is always considered the result of sin, as a divine punishment. Therefore, in the face of misfortune one can always wonder about the sin committed, as Tibullus does, or complain of the injustice of the gods, if there is no justification for punishment because there has been no crime. Finally, it should be recalled that Catullus in his *Carmen* 76 had previously invoked the aid of the gods to cure him of his love sickness, an aid he believes he has a right to by virtue of his *pietas*, that is, because he has led a perfectly unreproachable life in his dealings with gods and men. Great joy is reserved for such a *homo pius*, and so Catullus cannot explain his misfortune in love, believing he deserves a better life. The conditional clause is already present in Catullus (76.19): *si vitam puriter egi* (cf. Tib. 1.2.85, *si merui*, and Lygd. 4.15–16, *si . . .*).

14 frustra . . . pertimuisse: for the phrase, cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.3.23, *sine re nomen deus est frustraque timetur.*

frustr(a) immeritum: for the elision of a final long *-a* before an initial long *i-*, cf. Tib. 1.4.48, *oper(a) insuetas*; Prop. 3.2.6, *su(a) in muri*; Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, p. 75.

frustra: Lygdamus also uses *nequiquam* (5.27). According to Fordyce (369 *ad* Catul. 77.1) "*frustra* usually emphasizes the disappointment of

the agent, *nequiquam* the failure of his object", but in practice hardly any difference in meaning can be detected between the two terms, as Verrius Flaccus himself states in Fest. p. 162 M.: *'nequiquam' significare idem quod 'frustra', plurimis auctorum exemplis manifestum est.* In fact, in archaic literature the two adverbs are attested alongside each other, both in comedy and in tragedy, with no special nuance or tone distinguising them; even in Catul. 64, each adverb appears twice; in Lucretius, the count is 12 for *nequiquam*, 7 for *frustra*. However, from the Augustan period onwards, *nequiquam* seems to be reserved for highflown language: in the *Aeneid*, *nequiquam* appears 34 times, *frustra* 19; Horace uses *nequiquam* 3 times in the *Odes*, and just once in *Sat.* and *Ep.* Elegy avoids *nequiquam* as an elevated term belonging to epic (see Lygd. 5.27 [comm.]). Prose also avoids *nequiquam*: Cicero only uses it twice: *Quinct.* 79 and *Tusc.* 3.59 (here perhaps consciously, as he is translating a line of Euripides); the same tendency is found in Caesar (*nequ.* twice, *frustra* 10 times). Only Sallust and, above all, Livy are unequivocal supporters of *nequiquam*: in Sall. there are 4 uses of *nequ.* for 24 of *frustra*; Livy in his 1st Decade has *nequ.* 44 times, *frustra* 6; in the 3rd, *nequ.* 32, *frustra* 18. Nepos, Velleius, Seneca, Columella, the two Plinies and Suetonius never use *nequiquam*, Quintilian and Tacitus only once. On this question, see Ed. Wölfflin, "Frustra, nequiquam und Synonyma", *ALL* 2 (1885) 1–24; for statistics for *frustra/nequiquam*, see *ThLL* 6.1.1429–1430.

immeritum: ie 'namque id non merui'; cf. Lygd. 5.6 *immerito* (comm.).

pertimuisse . . . velit: *velit* is not optative here, but exhortative, and the perfect infinitive has a simple past value (cf. P. A. Perotti, "L'infinito perfetto in Tibullo e nel *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Orpheus* [1989] 142 n. 2); for a similar expression in Lygdamus, cf. 5.32, *nos fata fuisse velint!*

pertimuisse: the verb *pertimesco* belongs to prose. In poetry, with the exception of the prosaic verse of the comedy-writers (cf. Pl. *Bacch.* 862; *Rud.* 230; Ter. *Phorm.* 601) and [Verg.] *Cir.* 82 (with Lyne 138), it is only attested from Ovid onwards (19 times: cf. eg *Her.* 16.352; *Met.* 1.638; 2.495 [with Bömer 361]; 14.60; *Fasti* 2.340; *Ponto* 3.1.156), albeit sporadically (cf. Mart. 6.43.8; Apul. *Met.* 6.6). Perhaps because of this, Gebhardus emended the text to *praetimuisse* ("to fear too soon, in advance"), a conjecture adopted by Broukhusius, De Golbéry and Luck.

15: cf. Lygd. 5.12, *nec cor sollicitant facta nefanda meum.*

turpi . . . obnoxia facto: *turpi facto* functions as a dative governed by the adjective *obnoxius*, here in the sense of "prone to" (= *pronus*); cf. Acc. *Trag.* 429 R., *tete esse huic noxae obnoxium*; Hor. *Sat.* 2.7.8, *pars hominum . . . pravis obnoxia*; but especially Sall. *Cat.* 52.21, *animus . . . neque delicto neque lubidini obnoxius.* The poetic use of *obnoxius* is very rare: Verg. 2; Hor. 1; Tib. 1; Prop. 1; Ov. 6 (according to statistics by Bömer 278 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 5.235). For the expression *turpi facto*, cf. Cic. *Off.* 1.9, *honestumne factu sit an turpe dubitant id, quod in deliberationem cadit.*

turpi: *turpis* here is the opposite of *honestus* (cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.6.63, *qui turpi secernis honestum*). There are statistics for its use in Augustan poets in Bömer 305–306 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 5.315–316 (Verg. 13 [*Aen.* 4]; Hor. 37 [*Od.* 9]; Tib. 1; Prop. 25; Ov. 119 [*Met.-Fasti* 21]; Lygd. 2).

16: for the formulation of the line, cf. on the one hand Hor. *Epod.* 15.3, *tu, magnorum numen laesura deorum*; Lygd. 5.13–14, *nec nos insanae meditantes iurgia mentis / impia in adversos solvimus ora deos*; and on the other Tib. 1.2.79–80, *num Veneris magnae violavi numina verbo / et mea nunc poenas impia lingua luit*; 3.51–52, *non me periuria terrent, / non dicta in sanctos impia verba deos.*

laesit: "offended, blasphemed". For the use of *laedere* in the sense of "to offend the gods", cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.8, *quo numine laeso* (with Th. Birt, "Zu Vergil, *Aeneis* 1.8: *quo numine laeso*", *BPhW* 38 [1918] 212–216; W. Pötscher, *Vergil und die göttlichen Mächte*, *Spudasmata* 35 [Hildesheim 1977] 96 ff.); 2.183–184, *pro numine laeso / effigiem statuere*; Bömer 127–128 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 1.387. For the use of the word in reference to verbal abuse, cf. Prop. 1.16.37, *te* (scil. *ianuam*) *non ulla meae laesit petulantia linguae.* In elegy, the offence to the gods often lies in *periurium*, that is, offending the gods by not keeping a promise made in their name; cf. Hor. *Epod.* 15.3 *sup. cit.* (the first occurrence in Latin of the expression *numen laedere*); Tib. 1.3.79, *Danai proles, Veneris quos numina laesit* (with Putnam 85); 9.5–6, *aequum est impune licere / numina formosis laedere vestra semel*; Prop. 2.15.48, *laeserunt nullos pocula nostra deos* (with n. 106 by Ramírez de Verger 141); Lygd. 6.26, *laesi . . . dei* (comm.).

magnos . . . deos: "the mighty gods". Applied as an epithet to the deities, *magnus* refers to the strength and power of the god in question (cf. Cic. *Domo.* 144). This usage is attested in all periods of Latin from the earliest times; cf. Enn. *Ann.* 207; 491 V., *Saturnia, magna dearum*; Pl. *Aul.* 776, *magnus Iuppiter*, *Cist.* 522; *Poen.* 1163; *Truc.* 701, *di magni*; Ter. *Eun.* 709; Cic. *Nat.* 2.64; Catul. 14.12; 53.5; 109.3; Hor. *Od.* 1.10.5; *Epod.* 15.3, *magnorum . . . deorum*; *Sat.* 1.7.33–34, *per*

magnos, Brute, deos te / oro; 2.5.60, *magnus . . . Apollo* (= Verg. *Ecl.* 3.104; *Aen.* 9.654); Verg. *Ge.* 1.338–339, *magnae / . . . Cereri*; 3.1; *Aen.* 3.104, *Creta Iovis magni . . . insula*; 437; 9.82–83, *magnum / . . . Iovem*; 12.429, *maior . . . deus*; Tib. 1.2.81, *Veneris magnae . . . numina*; 6.50, *magna dea* (with Murgatroyd 199); [Tib.] 3.8.1; 11.9; 19.16; for *loci Ovidiani*, see the lengthy and learned note by Bömer 77–78 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 1.170, *ad magni tecta Tonantis*. At times the epithet *magnus* is applied to the *numen* of the god—originally an epic expression (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.623; 3.264; 633–634; 697), then extended; cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.8.18; *Met.* 2.428–429; 5.428 (with Bömer 338); 6.315; *Fasti* 5.684; Lygd. 6.22, *qui timet irati* (scil. *Bacchi*) *numina magna, bibat*—to a part of the body of the god (cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.3.6, *fulminantis magna manus Iovis*; Ov. *Met.* 1.595–596, *caelestia magna / sceptra manu teneo*) or to his descendants (cf. [Tib.] 3.7.68, *magna deum proles*). For *magnus* in connection with divinity, cf. Roscher, *Lex.*, vol. 7, Index s.v. *magnus*; *OLD magnus* 12b; *ThLL* 5.1.906.84–907.3. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that the epithet *magnus* was officially borne in Rome only by *Hercules Magnus Custos* (Bömer 349 *ad* Ov. *Fasti* 6.209; Norden 159–160 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 6.122–123) and the *Magna Deorum Mater Idaea* (Bömer, *Röm. Mitt.* 71 [1974] 130 ff.). On the other hand, *maximus* does seem to be an official epithet for Jupiter (G. Radke, *Die Götter Altitaliens* [1965] 159) and perhaps also for Juno (R. Rebuffat, "Les Phéniciens à Rome", *MEFR* 78 [1966] 7 ff.; J. Heuergon, "The inscriptions of Pyrgi", *JRS* 56 [1966] 3). Nor can it be ruled out that *magnus* is a reference to the physical proportions of the gods, for it was generally believed that both the gods and the deified emperors—in fact the divine epithet *magnus*, applied as a title to Domitian, stresses his divine status; cf. Stat. *Silv.* 2.5.27, *magni Caesaris*; 3.1.62, *magni . . . ducis* [= 3.4.57–58; 5.2.125]; 3.3.155, *summe ducum*; 183–184; 4.1.17; 46, *rex magne*; 2.14–15; 5.1.164–165—must be large in stature; cf. Stat. *Silv.* 1.1.18–20 and 4.2.26 (on Domitian); *Theb.* 7.750 (on Apollo); cf. H. Wagenvoort, *Roman Dynamism* (Oxford 1947) 114–116. It is not coincidental that Ovid, when describing the moment of the apotheosis of Hercules, emphasizes as a sign of his deificiation his greater corpulence and *gravitas*: *maiorque videri / coepit et augusta fieri gravitate verendus* (*Met.* 9.269–270). Note also the recurring mention of the enormous hand of Domitian by Statius (cf. *Silv.* 3.4.61 [with n. by Laguna 327–328]) and Martial (cf. 4.8.9–10; 30.4–5; 6.1.5), as an element related to the Emperor's divine status, in the style of Horace's *magna manus Iovis* (*Od.* 3.3.6); for a detailed study of this point, see F. Sauter, *Der römische Kaiserkult bei*

Martial und Statius (Stuttgart-Berlin 1934) 102–105; for *magnus* as a token of the grandiloquent and baroque style of Statius, cf. O. A. W. Dilke, "*Magnus Achilles* and Statian Baroque", *Latomus* 22 (1963) 498–503.

17–24: Lygdamus brusquely moves on to give us an account of his nocturnal vision. The absence of any transitional formula that might be expected is compensated for by the obvious change in style, which becomes clearly narrative, even openly epic, to judge by the prolix periphrasis employed, in extremely elevated tone, to indicate the time of day when the dream took place, at dawn (ll. 17–22). This, according to ancient belief, seems to have been the time reserved for prophetic dreams (cf. Mosch. *Eur.* 1 ff.; Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.33; Ov. *Her.* 19.195–196; Philostr. *VA* 2.37 p. 75 Kayser; cf. also the commentary above on l. 2). The model for this passage of Lygdamus is, beyond a doubt, Ov. *Her.* 19.193 ff. The chronological references in *iam* and *hic* are echoes of Ovid. However, although the narrative scheme used to introduce the chronological framework of the dream is identical, the epic images and the highflown rhetoric exclusively reflect the taste of Lygdamus; thus, where Ovid briefly writes *iam dormitante lucerna* to indicate that the night was nearing its end, Lygdamus states at great length *iam nox aetherium nigris emensa quadrigis / mundum caeruleo laverat amne rotas*; where Ovid has *sub Aurora*, Lygdamus has *cum summo Phoebus prospexit ab ortu*; and finally, the mundane simplicity with which Ovid describes the moment when he finally manages to drop off to sleep (*stamina de digitis cecidere sopore remissis, collaque pulvino nostra ferenda dedi*) is transformed into *pressit languentis lumina sera quies*, a formula which, though shorter, is extremely elevated in style. Note, too, that Ovid in contrast uses a transitional formula to introduce his story (*namque*, l. 195). The pluperfects (*laverat*, l. 18; *sopierat*, l. 19) help to underline the change in style.

17–18: the image of Night travelling in a horse-drawn chariot (*equi Noctis*) frequently appears in Greek poetry, though it is always post-Homeric, from A. *Ch.* 660–661, νυκτὸς ἅρμα . . . σκοτεινόν; *Fr.* 69.6 R., μελανίππου . . . νυκτός; E. *Io.* 1150, μελάμπεπλος δὲ Νὺξ ἀσείρωτον ζυγοῖς / ὄχημ' ἔπαλλεν; for the first time in Roman literature in Enn. *Scen.* 112–113 V. (= 96–97 J.), (*Nox*) *quae cava caeli signitenentibus conficis bigis*; and later in Verg. *Aen.* 5.721, *et Nox atra polum bigis subvecta tenebat*; Tib. 2.1.87, *iam Nox iungit equos*; [Verg.] *Cul.* 202, *quatit . . . biiugis oriens Erebois equos Nox*; Claud. *Pros.* 1.276, *sparso Nox humida somno / languida caeruleis invexerat otia bigis*; cf. also Ov. *Am.* 1.13.40, *lente currite,*

Noctis equi!; *Ponto* 1.2.54. Curiously, when the poets state exactly how the chariot of Night is drawn, they speak of two horses (*bigae* or *biiuges equi*), just as is the case with the chariot of the Moon (cf. E. *Io*. 1150–1151; Jocelyn *ad* Enn. *Scen*. 96 R^2 [= 112 V.; 97 J]; Varro *Men*. 92, *Lunae bigas*; [Virg.] *Cir*. 37–38 [with Lyne 117]; *Cul*. 283–284, *biiuges . . . Lunae . . . equos*; Manil. 5.3, *quadriiugis et Phoebus equis et Delia bigis*; Luc. *Civ*. 1.77–78; Sen. *Ag*. 818 (with Tarrant 326); *Phaed*. 312, *nocturnae bigae Lunae*; *Her. O*. 1520; Sil. 3.59; Val.-Flac. 2.295; Stat. *Theb*. 1.338; 6.688; 12.297). First in this form in E. *Io*. 1150–1151; cf. Enn. *Scen*. 112–113 V., cited above; Verg. *Aen*. 5.721, *Nox atra polum bigis subvecta tenebat*. Lygdamus is alone in stating that the chariot of Night is drawn by a team of four horses (*quadrigae*). However, this purported error of Lygdamus is in fact no such thing, since in the *Aeneid*, as Heyne already pointed out, Dawn sometimes comes with two horses (7.26, *Aurora in roseis fulgebat lutea bigis*), and at other times with four (6.535–536, *roseis Aurora quadrigis / iam medium aetherio cursu traiecerat axem*); that is, the number of horses is not fixed, but can vary depending on poetic taste.

The formulation of the pentameter imitates on the one hand Verg. *Ge*. 3.359, (*Sol*) *Oceani rubro lavit aequore currum*, and on the other Tib. 2.5.60, *Solis anhelantes abluit amnis equos*. The image of night descending into the Ocean is a standard poetic formula to express the idea of its coming to an end.

Such chronological periphrases—often based on mythology—are a common motif among the neoterics (cf. H. Tränkle, *Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache* [Wiesbaden 1960] 24) and enjoy great popularity as a rhetorical device in epic. Their overuse, especially to denote dawn and nightfall, eventually wore down their poetic force, and they degenerated into a clichéd and highly mannered motif among the poets of the empire; cf. Verg. *Aen*. 1.374; 4.6–7 (with Pease 90–91); 118–119; [Verg.] *Cul*. 42–44; 101–103; 107–108; 202–203; *Mor*. 1–2; Sen. *Apoc*. 2.1; Stat. *Silv*. 3.1.52–54 (with Laguna 148); Austin 178–179 *ad* Verg. *Aen*. 6.535; Curtius, pp. 387–388; D. O. Ross, "The *Culex* and *Moretum* as Post-Augustan Literary Parodies", *HSCP* 70 (1975) 244–246; H. Bardon, "L'aurore et le crépuscule (Thèmes et clichés)", *REL* 24 (1946) 82–115.

aetherium . . . mundum: ie *caelum*, "the firmament". This phrase only reoccurs in [Verg.] *Cul*. 101–102, *tendit inevectus radios Hyperionis ardor, / lucidaque aetherio ponit discrimina mundo*; Sen. *Phaed*. 332–334, *qua terra salo / cingitur alto, quaque aetherio / candida mundo sidera currunt*

(*ThLL* 8.1635.77). In fact, *mundum*, with no qualification, can in itself be absolutely equivalent to *caelum*; cf. Acc. *Trag*. 678, *splendida mundi sidera*; Lucr. 1.778, *a caelo ad terram, de terra ad sidera mundi*; 4.137, *nubis . . . mundi speciem violare serenam*; Catul. 64.206, *concussit micantia sidera mundi*; 66.1, *omnia qui magni dispexit lumina mundi*; Verg. *Ge*. 1.5, *vos, o clarissima mundi lumina*; *Aen*. 9.93, *sidera mundi*; [Verg.] *Aetna* 55, *Iuppiter . . . removet caligine mundum*; *Lydia* 149; Varro Atac. *fr*. 14.1 (= 11.1 Buechner); Manil. 1.848, *cum vaga per nitidum scintillant lumina mundum*; Sen. *Dial*. 11.7.1, *cuius umeris mundus innitur* [scil. *Atlas*]; Homer. Lat. 111, *nox erat et toto fulgebant sidera mundo*; Plin. *Nat*. 2.1, *mundum, est hoc, quod nomine alio caelum appellare libuit*; Macr. *Somn*. 1.20.8, *caelum, quod vere mundus vocatur*; 2.11.12, *mundus proprie caelum vocatur*; *OLD mundus* 1a; *ThLL* 8.1635.1 ff.; Fordyce 212 *ad* Catul. 47.2.

17 Nox: the personification, and goddess, of the night. In the *Theogony* of Hesiod she is the daughter of Chaos and sister of Erebus, the personification of the darkness of the underworld. Nox, in turn, begets Aether and Hemera and a whole range of abstractions: Chance, Sarcasm, Anguish, Deceit, Tenderness, Old Age, Discord, Vengeance, the Ceres and the Hesperides, as well as Sleep (*Hypnos*) and Dreams; cf. Ruiz de Elvira, *Mitología clásica*, pp. 58 ff. Night is a basic concept in the present elegy, as can be inferred from the excessive repetition of the terms *nocte* (ll. 2 and 7), *noctis* (ll. 9 and 13), and *Nox* (l. 17) in these introductory lines of the elegy. A similar repetition can be seen with the terms *somnia* (ll. 1 and 7), *somno* (l. 12), and *Somnus* (l. 20). This initial darkness is broken by the rising of the Sun (l. 21) and the appearance of Apollo in all his radiance.

nigris . . . quadrigis: black is the colour of night and, by extension, of anything connected with it; cf. Verg. *Aen*. 7.414, *Turnus . . . nigra carpebat nocte quietem*; Ov. *Met*. 15.187, *nigrae . . . nocti*; *Fasti* 4.662, *Nox venit et secum somnia nigra trahit*.

emensa: the verb *emetiri*, strictly "to measure" (cf. Verg. *Aen*. 10.772, *oculis spatium emensus quantum satis hastae*), can be applied not only to the measurement of space, "to cover a distance" (cf. Verg. *Aen*. 11.244, *iter emensi casus superavimus omnis*; Ov. *Fasti* 1.544, *orbis iter*; Val.-Max. 1.8.2, *prosperam emensi navigationem*; Liv. 21.30.5, *maiorem partem itineris emensam*; *ThLL* 5.2.480.81 ff.), but also time, "to live through a period of time", although this latter sense, except for Ov. *Met*. 15.186 (*cernis . . . emensas in lucem tendere noctes* [with Bömer 307]), is attested only in Silver Latin (cf. Sil. 3.555, *bis senos soles, totidem . . . saevas emensi noctes*; Tac. *Hist*. 1.49, *hunc exitum habuit . . . Galba, tribus et septuaginta*

annis quinque principes prospera fortuna emensus; *ThLL* 5.2.482.8 ff.); lying in the transition phase from the locative to the temporal senses are uses such as that of Val.-Max. 8.13. ext. 1, *Masinissa . . . hunc modum* (= *nonagesimum annum*) *excessit, regni spatium LX annis emensus.* Here, though undoubtedly used in the physical sense, "having crossed the vault of heaven", since it is Night that is being referred to, there is a strong underlying sense of the post-classical temporal meaning of *emetiri* anticipated by Ov. *Met.* 15.186 *sup. cit.* Except in Virgil, *emetiri* made little impact in the works of the Augustan poets: Verg. 5; Hor. 1; Tib. 0; Prop. 0; Ov. 2 (*Met.* 1; *Fasti* 1). The passive use of the perfect participle is attested from Verg. *Ge.* 1.450. The reading *dimensa* (G) or *demensa* (Ox_1V_2), which Baehrens regarded as a plausible one in his critical apparatus, is ingenious, in that the sense of *dimetiri*, "to measure exactly", would fit nicely the image of the chariot of Nox marking the hours of the night with the precision of a clock, but it is no more than that: an ingenious reading. Cf. Cic. *Tim.* 52, *mensum annorumque conversiones . . . sunt . . . spatium temporis dimensae.*

18 caeruleo . . . amne: ie *Oceano.* For the phrase, cf. Stat. *Silv.* 1.5.51, *caerulus amnis*; Aus. *Mos.* 84. The poetic designation of the Ocean as a simple "river" dates back to the Homeric model Ὠκεανὸς ποταμός (*Il.* 14.245–246 and *Od.* 11.639; cf. also Ὠκεανοῦ ῥοαί in *Il.* 3.5 and *Od.* 24.11, ἱεροῦ ποταμοῖο in Hes. *Th.* 788) and has its Latin antecedents in Verg. *Ge.* 4.233, *Oceani . . . amnis* (with Mynors 288), and Tib. 2.5.60, *Solis anhelantes abluit amnis equos* (with n. by Smith 463); cf. also Val.-Flac. 4.338, *sacro placati gurgitis amne*; 345, *aequora, qua rigidos eructat Bosporos amnes*; Alcim. 4.441, *Tanais . . . de monte ruens illiditur amni*; *ThLL* 1.1947.69–73. Broukhusius 316, against the manuscript tradition which unanimously transmits *caeruleo*, conjectures *caeruleas*, on the grounds that this adjective is frequently applied, in a sense equivalent to *niger*, to anything relating to night or darkness; in this respect, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.194, *caeruleus . . . imber*; 6.410; 8.622; Stat. *Silv.* 1.6.85, *caerulea Nox*; *Theb.* 2.527, *caerulea umbra*; applied to the chariot of a nocturnal divinity in [Verg.] *Cir.* 38, (scil. *Lunae*) *caeruleis . . . bigis* (with Lyne 118); Sil. 3.59, *Luna immissis per caerula bigis*; Claud. 33 (*Pros.* 1).276–277, *sparso Nox humida somno / languida* ***caeruleis*** *invexerat otia* ***bigis***; Serv. *Aen.* 3.64, *veteres sane caeruleum nigrum accipiebant*; *ThLL* 3.106.55–64. However, if this were the correct reading, Lygdamus would be guilty of an extremely clumsy redundancy, since he has just said *nigris . . . quadrigis* in the previous line. Besides, *caeruleus* strictly describes the colour of the sea ("dark blue, sea-green"; cf. Gell. 2.26;

Serv. *Aen.* 7.198, *caerulum est viride cum nigro, ut est mare*; Isid. *Orig.* 12.6.10) and the pre-eminently poetic combination is very frequent in Roman literature from Enn. *Ann.* 143; 385, *caeruleum . . . sale*; cf. also Pl. *Rud.* 268, *per caeruleas vias*; *Trin.* 834, *caeruleos per campos*; Lucr. 5.481, *ponti plaga caeruela*; Cic. *Ac.* 2.fr.5, *mare . . . caeruleum* (= [Verg.] *Cir.* 390); Catul. 36.11, *caeruleo . . . ponto*; 64.7, *caerula . . . aequora*; Verg. *Aen.* 4.583, *caerula verrunt*; 7.198, *per vada caerulea*; [Verg.] *Cir.* 483, *caeruleo . . . regno*; Tib. 1.3.37, *caeruleas undas* (= 4.45); Ov. *Her.* 15.106, *caerulea . . . via*; *Met.* 2.528, *gurgite caeruleo*; Luc. *Civ.* 2.220, *caeruleum . . . aequor*; Stat. *Theb.* 3.250, *stagna in caerulea*; Sil. 14.253, *caeruleis . . . campis*; Apul. *Met.* 4.28, *caeruleum profundum pelagi*; *ThLL* 3.104.40–81; it even goes so far as to become the habitual epithet (predominantly poetic, apart from Cic. *Nat.* 1.83, *caeruleos* [*oculos*] *esse Neptuni*) to describe the deities of the sea; cf. Fedeli 274 *ad* Prop. 3.7.62; Mynors 308 *ad* Verg. *Ge.* 4.388; Bömer 239 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.6, *caeruleos . . . deos*; 405 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 13.742, *caerula Doris*; 183 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 14.555; Van Dam 207 *ad* Stat. *Silv.* 2.2.21; Laguna 204 *ad* Stat. *Silv.* 3.2.13; Carter, *Epitheta deorum*, 1902, s.v.; Lesky, *Thalatta* (1947) 311, 119; André, *Termes de couleur*, p. 334; *ThLL* 3.104.82–105.44. Consequently, its being combined with *amne* would appear to be more acceptable. It should also be noted that, although the epithet *caeruleus* refers principally to the sea and its deities, its use extends, in an equally stereotyped way, to rivers and fountains, as well as to their protective divinities; cf. eg Verg. *Aen.* 8.64, *caeruleus Thybris* (when he is otherwise always described as *flavus*; cf. Bömer *ad* Ov. *Fasti* 6.228); Tib. 1.7.14, (*Cydnus*) *caeruleus*; Ov. *Met.* 3.342 *caerula Liriope* (with Bömer 540); 13.895. As a result, the phrase *caeruleo . . . amne*, even if *amnis* is equivalent to *Oceanus*, is far from being strange or inappropriate (or might it be reasonable to suspect that *amnis* stands for *Thybris* [cf. Verg. *Aen.* 8.64 *sup. cit.*]?). Furthermore, although the evidence cited above shows that *caeruleus* can be applied to Night and even to her chariot, it is no less true that in close combination with the sea, to which the epithet strictly belongs, (cf. André, *Termes de couleur*, p. 165), a skillful poet would avoid applying the adjective to Night or anything connected with her. The same can be said of *caeruleas . . . rotas* in the sense of "celestial wheels" (cf. [Verg.] *Cir.* 38, *candida lunae sidera, caeruleis orbem pulsantia bigis*; Sen. *Her. f.* 132, *caeruleis evectus equis*). For the two different forms *caeruleus* and *caerulus*, existing side-by-side from Ennius and Plautus in the same author, whose choice will depend on simple metrical convenience, cf. Bömer 540 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 3.342;

for statistics, cf. *ThLL* 3.103.83 ff.; on the possible etymologies put forward, as well as the different meanings of *caerulus/-leus*, cf. also K. E. Goetz, "Waren dir Römer Blaubind?", *ALL* 14 (1906) 75–88 (deriving it from *caelum* with dissimilation [**caelu-leus*]); H. Wagenvoort, "*Caerimonia*", *Glotta* 26 (1938) 129–130 = *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion*, 1956, pp. 99–100 (deriving it from an adjective **kairos*, "dark grey"); Walde-Hofmann, *LEW* I (1938) 133; J. André, "Le vocabulaire de la couleur", *REL* 19 (1941) 135–136, 139, 141; Mørland, *SO* 33 (1957) 106; N. V. Barran, "Les caractéristiques essentielles du vocabulaire chromatique latin", *ANRW* II 29.1 (1983) 366–367 ("L'évolution sémantique de *caeruleus-caerulus*").

19–20: night is reaching its close and Lygdamus has still not managed to get to sleep. Insomnia (ἀγρυπνία) is a classic symptom of love (*signum amoris*); cf. Pl. *Phdr.* 251E; Theocr. 10.10; 30.5 ff.; Pl. *Merc.* 4–5; Ter. *Eun.* 219; *AP* 5.152.3; 166; 7.195; 196 (Mel.); Catul. 68.5–6; Hor. *Od.* 3.7.7–8; Verg. *Aen.* 4.5 (with Pease 90); Ov. *Met.* 10.368–370; Val.-Flac. 7.1 ff.; Crinag. *AP* 5.119; Galen. 14.630 ff. Kühn; Macr. *Somn.* 1.3.6; Musae. 232–233 (with Kost); *AP* 5.279.4 (Paul. Sil.); recall, too, the well-known topos "everyone is asleep, except the anguished lover" (cf. eg A. R. 3.744 ff.; Theocr. 2.38 ff.; in particular Verg. *Aen.* 4.522–532, *Nox erat et placidum carpebant fessa soporem / corpora per terras . . . / [. . .] / At non infelix animi Phoenissa neque umquam / solvitur in somnos oculisve aut pectore noctem / accepit . . .*, the progression of which seems to be echoed in Lygdamus' *iam Nox . . . / nec me sopierat* [*Somnus*], ll. 17–19), an erotic variant on the famous literary motif of insomnia in which a contrast is brought out between the calm of the night (with *nox erat* or *nox erat, et* as the most frequent introductory formulas in Latin; cf. Stearns, *Studies of the Dream as a technical Device in Latin Epic and Drama*, 1921, pp. 21–22 n. 65) and the preoccupations which prevent the likes of soldiers, generals, heroes and gods from sleeping. Finally, insomnia as a literary motif to suggest anguish or grief goes as far back as the Homeric poems: eg *Il.* 2.1–2 (Zeus); 10.1–4 (Agamemnon); *Od.* 20.5–6 (Ulysses); 54–58 (Penelope); cf. the long list of examples in Pease 434–436 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 4.522–532 *sup. cit.*; H. McL. Currie, "Closure/transition and the *nox erat* topos: some notes", *LCM* 18.6 (June 1993) 92–95 (with *loci*). The motif of the *pervigilans amator* is particularly frequent in Roman elegy; cf. Tib. 1.2.75–80; 8.64; 2.4.11 ff.; Prop. 1.1.33; 3.39–40; 11.5; 2.17.3–4; 22B.47–48; 25.47; 3.15.1–2; 4.3.29 ff.; 7.5–6; Ov. *Am.* 1.2.1–4 (with McKeown 34); *Her.* 12.171 ff.; 19.55–56; *Ars* 1.735,

vigilatae . . . noctes (with Hollis 145). As with Night previously, Lygdamus again makes use of personification, this time of Sleep.

19 menti deus utilis aegrae: for Sleep as a remover of care, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.268–269, *tempus erat, quo prima quies mortalibus aegris / incipit et dono divum gratissima serpit*; Ov. *Ponto* 1.2.43–44, *requies medicinaque publica curae Somnus*; cf. also Verg. *Ge.* 3.530, *nec somnos abrumpit cura salubres*. The positive and soothing description of sleep goes back to Hom. *Il.* 2.71, γλυκὺς ὕπνος. For the poetic periphrasis in Lygdamus, cf. Ov. *Fasti* 3.173, *deus utilis armis* (ie *Mars*), the only similar formulation.

utilis: applied to people, it has the meaning of "beneficial" and is used with the ethic dative (cf. Cic. *De or.* 3.137, *non fuit ille quidem civibus suis utilis*); for the Lygdamean hexameter-ending, cf. Ov. *Tr.* 3.3.9, *non hic cibus utilis aegro/*. Ovid makes substantial use of the adjective in comparison with other poets: Verg. 4 times (only in *Ge.*); Hor. 15 (4 with the dative); Tib. 0; Prop. 4; Ov. 64; *Epist. Sapph.* 1; Lygd. 1 (statistics from Bömer 113 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 14.321).

menti . . . aegrae: ie *animo aegro curis*. This is the only known occurrence of the phrase *mens aegra*. The usual phrase to refer to the "tortured, tormented soul" is *animus aeger*; cf. Liv. 21.53.2, *animo magis quam corpore aegrum*; 1.58.8, *aegram animi*; Enn. *Scen.* 392, *animus aeger semper errat*; *Scen.* 254, *Medea animo aegro, amore saevo saucia*; Sall. *Iug.* 71.2; Liv. 2.42.10; 25.38.3; Verg. *Aen.* 1.208, *curisque ingentibus aeger*; Ov. *Tr.* 4.6.43, *corpore sed mens est aegro magis aegra*; Sen. *Oed.* 204; Sil. 13.402, *pectoris aegri*; 8.166, *tristi . . . Dido aegerrima vultu*. The presence of *menti* can be explained as a case of brachylogy for the expression *menti <animi> aegrae*. For the phrase *mens <animi>*, "the soul, the spirit", cf. Pl. *Ep.* 530, *pavor territat mentem animi*; Catul. 65.4, *nec potis est dulcis Musarum expromere fetus / mens animi*.

The adjective *aeger* (like *aegrotatus* and *saucius*) in the *sermo amatorius* points to the elegiac motif of love as an ailment (*morbus*); cf. Prop. 2.4.21; Ov. *Rem.* 109; 313–314; A. La Penna, "Note sul linguaggio erotico dell'elegia latina", *Maia* 4 (1951) 206–207.

20 Somnus sollicitas deficit ante domos: ie 'sollicitos dormire curae non sinunt'. That Lygdamus' insomnia, though he does not say so explicitly here, is due to the cares of love is clarified by 6.59–61, where he declares his firm intention never again to lose sleep over a woman. Cf. spec. 6.61, *sollicitus repetam tota suspiria nocte*.

Somnus: the god Sleep (Ὕπνος) is the son of Erebus and Nyx, and twin brother of Thanatos, Death; cf. Hes. *Th.* 211; 758; Ruiz de Elvira, *Mitología clásica*, pp. 37 and 58–59. A detailed picture of this

god, together with an exhaustive description of his enchanted palace, in which all sleep (*domus Somni*), can be found in Ov. *Met.* 11.592–645, a depiction almost certainly known to Lygdamus, as can be inferred from certain echoes. Thus, the indirect allusion to the god by means of the periphrasis *menti deus utilis aegrae* (l. 19) recalls the way in which Iris addresses Sleep in the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid: *Somne, quies rerum, placidissime, Somne, deorum, / pax animi, quem cura fugit* (l. 623–624, with Bömer 405); *sopierat* (l. 19) picks up *soporiferam Somni . . . aulam* (l. 586); and the pentameter (l. 20) is simply the reverse of (*Somnus*), *quem cura fugit* in l. 624 of the Ovidian work; cf. also Sen. *Herc. f.* 1065–1066, *tuque, o domitor, Somne, malorum,* ***requies animi****, pars humanae melior vitae*. In certain authors, Sleep is the driver of the chariot of Night (cf. Stat. *Theb.* 2.59, *Sopor obvius illi Noctis agebat equos*; Claud. *Carm.* 15 (*Bell. Gildon.*) 213–214, *humentes iam Noctis equos, Letheaque Somnus / frena regens, tacito volvebat sidera curru*). Elsewhere Sleep forms part of Night's retinue (cf. Tib. 2.1.89–90, *postque (Noctem) venit tacitus furvis circumdatus alis / Somnus et incerto Somnia nigra pede*). In Hom. *Il.* 2.1–71 Hypnos is the messenger of Zeus.

sollicitas: cf. Serv. *Ecl.* 10.6, *sollicitos: sollicitatos, plenos sollicitudinis*. For the anxiety of the lover, cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.15.38, *sollicito . . . amante*; 2.10.12; *Her.* 1.12, *res est solliciti plena timoris amor*; 18.196; *Ars* 3.472; 600; *Rem.* 557; Nemes. *Ecl.* 4.60, *sollicitos . . . amantes*; Pichon, p. 265. That the adjective describes Lygdamus' state of mind is proved by its recurrence in 6.36 and 61.

deficit: "vanishes". The image is that of Sleep flying in from his dwelling-place in Erebus, stopping in front of the house and passing by, on seeing that preoccupation dwells therein. The two possible intransitive meanings of *deficere*, "to leave, to abandon" and "to cease, to fail, to expire", come together in this passage; cf. Val.-Max. 8.11.1, *cum . . . serena nocte subito Luna defecisset*. N. Heinsius (*ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.382; *Ex adversariis* caput I; *Notae in Tibullum*) held that the 2nd hemistich should read *deficit ille domos* or (*sollicitos*) *desit is ante toros*, or even (*ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.382) *deserit ille domos*, this last conjecture being accepted by Luck.

21–22: at dawn, Lygdamus finally manages to fall asleep.

21 tandem: "at last". There is still evidence of the original adversative sense of this particle (= *tamen*) in the archaic period (Pl. *Aul.* 371; Enn. *Scen.* 209; Titin. *Com.* 58; cf. Non. p. 405, *'tandem' significat et 'tamen'*; R. Godel, *Cahiers de Saussure* 8 [1949] 61 ff.). Its temporal sense in the classical period (= *denique*) is the result of a brachylogy

based on the phrase *tandem iam*; cf. Hofmann-Szantyr 497 (§ 267 *Zus.* d). It generally begins the line (cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.15.2; Tib. 2.5.46; [Tib.] 3.13.1) or else occupies the second position (Verg. *Ge.* 4.344, */et tandem . . .*).

cum summo Phoebus prospexit ab ortu: the meaning and text of this time clause have always been the object of heated debate. Maintaining the unanimous ms. reading, which is followed by most editors and commentators, who take it as: "when from his height Phoebus looked out", would mean that Lygdamus here is referring to a time well on into the day, or at least some time after the night came to an end, which in no way coincides with the theory of truthful dreams at dawn. This has prompted some commentators to alter the transmitted text. Markland (90 *ad* Stat. *Silv.* 2.2.45) proposed *summa . . . ab Oeta*, quoting Sen. *Her. f.* 132–133, *iam caeruleis evectus aquis Titan summa prospicit Oeta*; *Her. O.* 865–866, *renatum prima quae poscit diem Oeta*, and recalling the mysterious practice of the Roman poets of naming Mt. Oeta in Thessaly in connection with the rising of the moon, the evening-star or the sun; cf. in this respect Catul. 62.7, *Oetaeos ostendit Noctifer ignes* (with Fordyce 256); Verg. *Ecl.* 8.30, *tibi deserit Hesperus Oetam*; [Verg.] *Cir.* 349–350, *postera lux ubi laeta diem mortalibus almum / et gelida venientem ignem quatiebat ab Oeta*; *Cul.* 203, *piger aurata procedit Vesper ab Oeta*. In view of this, why not *cum summa Phoebus processit ab Oeta*, "when Phoebus advanced from the peak of Oeta"? Heyne 203–204 (*ad loc.*) gave a fresh interpretation to the traditional text: "when Phoebus with the upper edge of his disc looked out" (cf. Ov. *Fasti* 3.361, *ortus erat summo tantummodo margine Phoebus*); this would be a reference to the moment following the end of night, that is, to the first rays of the sun. In support of this, Tränkle 113 cites further evidence of this metonymic use of *ortus* to refer to the rising sun (cf. [Tib.] 3.7.65–66, (*Cimmerion*) *quis numquam candente dies apparuit ortu, / seu supra terras Phoebus seu curreret infra*; Sen. *Apoc.* 7.2 l. 9–10, *iugum, quod Phoebus ortu semper obverso videt*), as well as examples of the use, *metri causa*, of prepositional phrases with *ab* equivalent to an instrumental ablative (cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.417–418, *umor ab igne / percaluit solis*; 3.221, (*canis*) *nigram medio frontem distinctus ab albo*). It has not been understood that *summo* here does not function as an adjective in agreement with *ortu*, but is substantivized in the sense of "surface <of the sea>". In poetic formulas, the rising and setting of the sun and the appearance and departure of night (or the moon) always occur over the sea, that is, on the surface of the sea, which is confused

with the horizon. And more so here, when just a few lines previously Night was said to sink into the sea. There is ample evidence of *summum* in the sense of "surface of a liquid"; cf. Cic. *Fin.* 3.48, *qui demersi sunt in aqua . . . si non longe absunt a summo*; Sen. *Nat.* 5.5.2, *muscum . . . innasci aquis et herbosa quaedam videmus summo innantia*; Petr. *Satyr.* 137.10, *nuces . . . mersit in vinum. Et sive in summum redierant, sive subsederant, ex hoc coniecturam ducebat*; Plin. *Nat.* 9.35, *testudines evectae in summa pelagi.* To describe the moment when the first ray of sun appears on the surface of the sea, Lygdamus has fallen back on the well-known image of the god of the sea raising his head out of the waves to have a look around (cf. Verg. *Ge.* 4.352, [*Arethusa*] *prospiciens summa flavum caput extulit unda*; Aen. 1.126–127, [*Neptunus*] *alto / prospiciens summa placidum caput extulit unda*; Ov. *Met.* 5.413, *gurgite quae* [*nympha Cyane*] *medio summma tenus exstitit alvo*; 487, [*Arethusa*] *caput . . . extulit undis*; Col. 10.156, *caput efferet undis*): "When at dawn Phoebus-Sol looked out over the surface of the sea (= the horizon)". The adaptation is a faulty one, mixing images of the sun-star (*ortu*) and the sun-god (*Phoebus prospexit*). Note, however, how the panegyrist of Messalla was rather more successful: *oriente die . . . / splendidior liquidis cum Sol caput extulit undis* ([Tib.] 3.7.122–123). For the chronological periphrasis (= *sub Aurora*), see Lygd. 4.17–18 (comm.).

Phoebus: "the shining one", epithet and often name of Apollo, in his own right or as god of the sun. In Latin, when the sun-god is called *Phoebus*, the term *Apollo* is not normally added. Note that Phoebus is presented in this elegy as acting with the three most important attributes of the many facets of this god:

I) In the present line, as sun-god. The identification of *Phoebus Apollo* with the sun, quite standard in Roman poetry and the whole of the later classical tradition down to our days, is found neither in Homer nor in Greek epic and lyric before the 5th c. BC, since in the Hellenic tradition there is a particular deity, *Helios Hyperion*, representing the sun-star. Apollo, then, was not originally a sun-god; cf. K. Wernicke, *RE* 2.1 19–21 s.v. *Apollon*; Jessen, *RE* 8.1 75–76 s.v. *Helios*; L. R. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States* (Oxford, Clarendon Press 1896–1909) IV, pp. 136–144; O. Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte* (Munich, C. H. Beck 1906) 1240–1244; H. J. Rose, *Handbook of Greek Mythology* (New York, Dutton; London, Methuen; 1928) 33–34; 134. The first clear evidence of complete identification of the sun and Apollo is a fragment of the *Phaethon* of Euripides, a tragedy probably dated no earlier than 420 BC: ὦ καλλιφεγγὲς Ἥλι', ὥς μ' ἀπώλεσας / καὶ τόνδ'· Ἀπόλλων δ' ἐν βροτοῖς ὀρθῶς καλεῖ, / ὅστις

τὰ σιγῶντ' ὀνόματ' οἶδε δαιμόνων (E. *Fr.* 781.11–13 Nauck [= 224–225 Diggle]); in the Hellenistic period there is little evidence (Call. *Fr.* 302 Pff. [= *Hecale* 8 Mair]; *Orph. Hymn.* 34.3.5 and 8; [Eratosth.] *Catast.* 24 [= p. 140 Rob.]), the syncretism becoming general among Latin men of letters and poets, according to *communis opinio*; cf. Gruppe, *op. cit.* 1240 n. 3; Farnell, *op. cit.* 4.137; Wernicke, *op. cit.* II.19–20; *OCD* 82 s.v. *Apollo*; Ruiz de Elvira, *Metamorfosis*, vol. II, p. 206 n. 46; id., *Mitología clásica*, pp. 81–82; Bömer 244–245 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.24. However, J. E. Fontenrose in a detailed study ("Apollo and the Sun-god in Ovid", *AJPh* 61 [1940] 429–444 [summary in *PAPA* 69, 1938, 36–37]) argues that Ovid, who is generally pointed to as the individual mainly responsible for the prevalence of the concept of Apollo as sun-god in modern times, never actually identifies Apollo with this figure. In Ovid, the two divinities only share the epithet *Phoebus* (statistics in Fontenrose, *art. cit.*, pp. 443–444), which is the factor lying behind the confusion. This epithet strictly belongs to Apollo, but its meaning ("shining", "pure", "radiant") made it equally appropriate for the sun-god, a cross-over which might already have been made by the Alexandrian poets, although no evidence has come down to us; among the Latin poets, however, it is common to give the name *Phoebus* to the Sun (eg Hor. *Od.* 3.21.24; *Saec.* 1 [cf. 9]; Lygd. 4.21; [Tib.] 3.7.66; 145; 158; Verg. *Aen.* 4.6; 18 examples in Ovid), or even to apply to it the terms *nitidus* or *candidus*, the direct translation into Latin. In a later study, though one published earlier, ("Apollo and Sol in the Latin Poets of the First Century B.C.", *TAPhA* 70 [1939] 439–455; statistics on *Phoebus* on pp. 454–455), Fontenrose extends his Ovidian thesis to all the poets of the 1st c. BC: «Not only Ovid . . ., but all the Latin poets of the first century B.C., distinguish clearly between Apollo and Sol» (p. 439); the syncretism of this century, in his view, was still the minority view-point of a handful of philosophers and scholars. Fontenrose attributes the prevalent modern idea of Apollo as sun-god to the writings of the old Christian authors against pagan philosophers, "among whom this conception of Apollo had gained general acceptance" (p. 453). He upholds the same argument in connection with the present passage of Lygdamus: "This verse [Lygd. 4.21] immediately precedes a vision of Apollo as *citharoedus*, wherein his *candor* and *color purpureus* are emphasized. But we are not to suppose that the *Phoebus* of line 21 is the god of the vision. The poet is merely saying that after a sleepless night he fell asleep at dawn and had a dream in which Apollo ap-

peared to him. And, as I have already pointed out, all gods have a radiant body. Apollo is not the sun, even though he shines" (p. 450). In my opinion, Lygdamus identifies or at least deliberately seeks to relate Apollo with the Sun, and he does so precisely by making use of the common epithet *Phoebus* and avoiding the proper and unmistakable name of each of them (*Apollo,* and *Sol* or *Titan* respectively); and this for two reasons: 1) because the vision of Apollo coincides with the appearance of the sun; 2) because the brilliance of the sun intensifies the youthful splendour of Apollo. In addition, although Fontenrose's thesis may indeed be valid for the poets of the 1st c. BC, the author has not taken into account the more correct later dating for the poetic work of Lygdamus. Note, in addition, that in the same poem Lygdamus refers to the Moon as *Latonia Luna* (4.29), an unmistakable sign that he is identifying it fully with Diana; it is therefore by no means strange that he should make a parallel identification between her brother Apollo and the Sun.

II) Later on, Apollo in person introduces himself to Lygdamus as god of soothsaying and prophecy (ll. 47–50). As such, a great number of oracles and sanctuaries were dedicated to him, both in Asia Minor and in Greece, which were visited by people from all parts who wished to consult and receive the god's replies through his priestesses, the Sibyls. The most famous sanctuary of Apollo in Antiquity was the one at Delphi.

III) Apollo is also a god of music and poetry, the god of song and the lyre (Apollo Citharoedus). As such he was represented on Mount Parnassus, where he presided over the contests of the Muses (Apollo Musagetes). His oracles were generally formulated in verse, and he was the inspiration both of seers and of poets. He shares this function of providing inspiration with Dionysus but is distinguished from him by being more restrained. It is in this light that Homer presents him to us, when he describes the gods listening to "the chords of the graceful lyre of Apollo" (*Il.* 1.603). And it is in this guise, that of Apollo Citharoedus, that he appears to Lygdamus (ll. 35–42). Furthermore, Apollo's preoccupation with Lygdamus is that of the patron of poetry with one of his poets (ll. 43–44). In ll. 67–72 (comm.) there is even a direct reference to Apollo the shepherd; on the other hand, Apollo never appears in Lygdamus as the god of the bow or of medicine.

prospicio: in archaic poetry and prose, *prospicio* is mainly used in the figurative sense ("to look after, care for"); cf. Pl. *Trin.* 688, *non ego*

mihi te tam prospicere qui meam egestatem leves; in Terence, of its 14 occurrences, it only once appears in its proper sense as a verb of seeing, in *Phorm.* 735. Furthermore, when *prospicio* is used in its proper sense by the comedy-writers, it simply denotes the ability to see; cf. Pl. *Amph.* 1059, *caput dolet, neque audio, nec oculis prospicio satis*; *Curc.* 317, *perii; prospicio parum*; Ter. *Phorm.* 735, *nisi* . . . *parum prospiciunt oculi.* The same preponderance of the figurative sense is also found in Ciceronian prose (cf. Cic. *Verr.* 1.22, *vos, quod ad vestram famam* . . . *pertinet, iudices, prospicite atque consulite*; however, cf. *Verr.* 5.169, *ut ille* . . . *ex cruce Italiam cernere ac domum suam prospicere posset*). Classical poetry, on the other hand, goes back to the *propria vis verbi*: Lucretius and Horace use the word exclusively in its original sense ("to look into the distance"); cf. Lucr. 4.826; Hor. *Od.* 3.2.6; 25.10; *Ep.* 1.10.23. In Virgil and Ovid both meanings are found, but the original sense is predominant; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.127; 4.410; 6.357; 11.839; Ov. *Her.* 10.49; 16.58; *Fasti* 1.639; 6.191; 205; *Met.* 2.190 [with Bömer 290]; 3.604; 8.237; 330; 11.715); cf. also Tib. 1.5.72; 2.5.58; Ch. Guiraud, *Les verbes signifiant 'voir' en Latin* (Paris: Klincksieck 1964) 18–19; 77–80 (for the *prospicio/prospectare* confusion). Note, in addition, how the verbs meaning "to see" are quite often used in connection with the sun-god, no doubt in line with the topos of Helios as a deity who sees everything; cf. Pi. *Paean.* 9.1 ff. Snell (= *Fr.* 51 Turyn), ἀκτὶς ἀελίου, τί πολύσκοπε μήσεαι, ὦ μᾶτερ ὀμμάτων . . .; S. *El.* 824–825; Pl. *R.* 6.507D ff.; Luc. *DDeor.* 17; Ov. *Met.* 1.769; 2.32, *Sol oculis iuvenem quibus adspicit omnia, vidit*; 4.172, *videt hic deus* (scil. *Sol*) *omnia primus* (with Bömer 70); 195, (*Sol*) *qui* . . . *omnia cernere debes*; 226–228, *ille ego sum* . . . / *omnia qui video, per quem videt omnia tellus, / mundi oculus* (with Bömer 86); 7.96, *cernentem cuncta*; 13.852–853, *non haec omnia magnus / Sol videt e caelo?*; 14.375, *qui pervidet omnia, Solem*; *Fasti* 4.581–584; Pease 483–484 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 4.607; Fontenrose 434 and n. 11.

ab ortu: the same hexameter-ending in Ov. *Met.* 2.112.

22: the well-known literary metaphor of sleep weighing heavily on weary limbs. For the use of *premere* in connection with sleep, cf. Laber. 4, *me optimus somnus premit*; [Verg.] *Cul.* 160, *securo pressos somno mandaverat artus*; Liv. 7.35.11, *quod tempus mortales somno altissimo premit*; 22.50.4, *dum* . . . ***quies*** *nocturna hostes* ***premeret***; Ov. *Ars* 3.647–648, *sunt quoque quae faciant altos medicamina somnos / victaque Lethaea lumina nocte premant*; *Met.* 15.21, *pressum gravitate soporis*; Col. *Rust.* 7.10.4, *quodam veterno pressum* (*pecus*); Plin. Nat. 10.211; Sen. *Ep.* 70.23, *tamquam somno premente*; Apul. *Met.* 5.20; cf. *OLD premo* 18. For the image of sleep closing the eyes,

cf. Catul. 50.10, *nec somnus tegeret quiete ocellos*, also in the context of insomnia; Ov. *Am.* 3.5.1 (*Somnium Ovidianum*), *nox erat, et somnus lassos submissit ocellos*; but especially Tib. 1.2.2, *occupet ut fessi lumina victa sopor.* However, the specific image of the **weight** of sleep closing heavy eyelids only appears, apart from Lygdamus, in Prop. 1.10.7, *quamvis premeret mihi somnus ocellos*; [Sen.] *Oct.* 116–117, *membra cum solvit quies / et fessa fletu lumina oppressit sopor*; cf. also the description of the god Somnus in Ov. *Met.* 11.618–619, *tardaque deus gravitate iacentes vix oculos tollens iterum iterumque relabens.* Moreover, in Lygdamus the metonymic use of *lumina* ("light") for *ocellos* introduces at the same time the literary metaphor of the sleep of night. For the phrase *premere lumen/-ina* in the sense of "to drive out the light, to darken", cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.81, *lumen ... obscura vicissim luna premit*; Luc. *Civ.* 8.615; Sen. *Ag.* 493 (metaphorically used of death), *premunt tenebrae lumina*; *CIL* 11.1122.

Note, in addition, the striking parallelism between Lygdamus' image of the sleep of night and the epic formula with which Virgil represents the moment of death as the sleep of an everlasting night; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 10.745–746, *olli dura quies oculos et ferreus urget / somnus, in aeternam claudantur lumina noctem.* For death closing eyes, like sleep, cf. Prop. 2.13.17, *nostros mors claudet ocellos*; Ov. *Met.* 3.503, *lumina mors clausit* (with Bömer 568); cf. also Catul. 64.188, *languescent lumina morte.* For the analogy between the sleep of night and the eternal night of death, cf. Ov. *Her.* 10.111–112, *crudeles somni, quid me tenuistis inertem? / at semel aeterna nocte premenda fui.*

languentis: not from fever or illness, but because of the sleepless night; cf. Acc. *Trag.* 612, *iam ... somno pectora languent*; Lucr. 4.40, *simulacra ... quae nos horrifice languentis saepe sopore excierunt*; Val.-Flac. 4.388, *languentia lumina somno*; Sil. 12.250; *ThLL* 7.2.921.45–46; cf. Lygd. 5.28 (comm.).

lumina: ie *oculi.* A frequent metonymic use in poetic Latin—'usu ... apud prosae scriptores non obvio ante Cels. Sen. philos.' (*ThLL*)—probably originating by brachylogy from the formula *lumina oculorum.* It is attested several times in Lucr.; frequently in Catul., Tib., Prop. (cf. Enk 178–179 *ad* 2.12.23), and with greater frequency in Verg. and, especially, Ov. (cf. Bömer 535 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 3.335); *ThLL* 7.2.1819.71–1820.21. The singular *lumen* is quite rare in this metonymic use; cf., however, Catul. 64.86, *hunc simul ac cupido conspexit lumine virgo*; Verg. *Aen.* 8.153; 12.220; Ov. *Met.* 2.470; 752; 787; 857; *Tr.* 3.2.20; *CLE* 544 B 6; 1196.2.

sera quies: the same expression is found in Verg. *Aen.* 8.30,

seramque . . . quietem/. Some mss. read *fessa*, instead of *sera*, in agreement with *lumina* (cf. Tib. 1.8.68, *fletu lumina fessa*; especially Ov. *Her.* 19.56, *subit furtim lumina fessa sopor/*). The corruption was no doubt facilitated not only by the easily-confused letters, but by the considerable frequency with which the adjective *fessus* appears in connection with sleep (cf. eg Verg. *Ecl.* 5.46, *quale sopor fessis in gramine*; *Aen.* 8.26, *animalia fessa . . . sopor altus habebat*; Tib. 1.3.88, *puella . . . somno fessa remittat opus*; Stat. *Silv.* 5.4.4, *simulant fessos curvata cacumina somnos*; and especially Ov. *Met.* 8.83–84, *prima quies aderat, qua curis fessa diurnis / pectora somnus habet*). Note, however, that the *prima quies* of this last example—that is, the first period of sleep, when night has just fallen (*nox intervenit*, l. 82)—offers support 'e contrario' for the reading *sera quies*—the final period of sleep, at dawn; besides, *fessa* alongside *languentis* would be a pleonasm. Tib. 1.2.2, *occupet ut fessi lumina victa sopor* explains the reading *lumina victa* of the *codex Hamburgensis* (*H*) as a learned conjecture attributable to some humanist (cf. Ov. *Her.* 16[*Paris Helenae*].102, *lumina cum placido victa sopore iacent*; *Rem.* 500, *somno lumina victa dedi*).

The term *quies* in the whole of the *Corpus Tibullianum* only appears here and in l. 2. Nor does it seem to be frequent in the other elegists. Its use might rather be due to the above-mentioned epic tone of this section. The fact that the combination *sera quies* is only attested in Virgil confirms this epic influence, as does the epic formula *prima quies* (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.268, *tempus erat quo prima quies mortalibus aegris incipit*; Ov. *Met.* 8.83 *sup. cit.*).

23–81: epiphany of Apollo. This section is subdivided into two parts. The first (ll. 23–42) comprises the appearance of the god in a dream and a physical description of his youthful beauty and divine attributes; the second (ll. 43–81) contains his speech. The epiphany starts with the god taking possession of Lygdamus' sleep (23 *hic* [= 21–22 *somnus*]), and the introduction to his address by means of a *verbum dicendi* (42 *edidit haec . . . verba*). Both syntagmata are taken up again, in the reverse order, at the close of the epiphany (81 *dixit, et ignavus defluxit corpore somnus*).

23–24: Apollo appears in a dream.

23 hic: "at that moment", ie *sub aurora*. Though strictly an adverb of place, *hic* can sometimes express temporal relationships, indicating a specific point in time (= *in hoc tempore, occasione, eventu*); cf. *ThLL* 6.3.2766.3 ff. More to be expected would be *tunc* or *tum*; cf. eg Verg.

Aen. 2.199. Note too the presence of temporal *hic* in the Ovidian model for this passage (*Her.* 19.199, *hic* [= *sub aurora*]).

23 iuvenis casta redimitus tempora lauro: a long periphrasis to refer to the god Apollo. The wreath of laurel, the Apollonian plant par excellence, unambiguously identifies this god as the one appearing here. This initial clue is joined in the following distichs by the reference to the god's unshorn locks (l. 27) and the description of the lyre that hangs from his left side (ll. 37 ff.). But it is not until l. 50 that the god introduces himself in his own words, although even then he uses the patronymic expression *Cynthius*. Curiously, his own name, *Phoebus*, has already appeared twice: the first time shortly before his appearance, when he is mentioned in connection with the sun, and the second in the mouth of the deity himself, though associated in the 3rd person with other divinities in his capacity as god of poetry. Through this deliberate anonymity Lygdamus seeks to create an atmosphere of mystery and suspense, playing at the same time with the learning of the ancient reader. The formulation of the line clearly reflects the influence of Verg. *Aen.* 3.81, (*Phoebi sacerdos*) *vittis et sacra redimitus tempora lauro/*, and Tib. 2.5.5, *ipse* (scil. *Phoebus*) *triumphali devinctus tempora lauro/*.

iuvenis: a physical characteristic of the god Apollo is the eternal youthfulness of his radiant beauty. Cf. Mart. 4.45.7, *perpetuo sic flore mices . . .* (*Phoebe*).

redimitus tempora lauro: the common Latin construction of the accusative of respect, frequent with nouns denoting parts of the human body (*i.a.*) and passive perfect participles of verbs in the semantic group "tie, adorn" (*i.a.*), as in Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.110, *fronde comas victi*; this construction, originally confined to the perfect participle, is later extended in poetry to finite verbal forms under Greek influence; on this, see Kühner-Stegmann 2.1.285; Hofmann-Szantyr 36–38 (§ 44); Ernout-Thomas 29 (§ 38); Bassols I.48–50 (§ 36).

redimitus tempora: for this Virgilian phrase (always after the penthemimeral caesura), cf. Verg. *Ge.* 1.349, *redimitus tempora quercu/*; *Aen.* 3.81 *r. t. lauro/*; Ov. *Met.* 14.654, *r. t. mitra/* (with Bömer 207); Sen. *Oed.* 430, *r. t. sertis/*; Val.-Flac. 1.278, *r. t. vittis/*; *CLE* 856.13, *r. t. flore/*; E. Lissberger, *Das Fortleben der römischen Elegiker in der Carmina epigraphica*, Diss. Tübingen (1934) 82; Schumann, *LHL* 4, p. 474.

tempora lauro/: hexameter-ending with a clear Virgilian echo; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.81 *sup. cit.*; 5.246 (*Aeneas*) *viridique advelat tempora lauro*; 539, (*Aeneas*) *cingit viridanti tempora lauro/*; Tib. 2.5.5 *sup. cit.*; Ov.

Am. 2.13.1, *ite triumphales circum mea tempora laurus/*; [Albinov.] *Liv.* 459; Val.-Flac. 4.334; further *loci* in Schumann, *LHL* V, p. 386.

casta . . . lauro: in describing the laurel as "chaste" there is an indirect learned allusion to the famous legend of Daphne, the nymph metamorphosed into a laurel tree by her father, the river-god Peneus (according to other versions, the river Ladon; cf. Paus. 10.7.8), to prevent her from being raped by Apollo, who then adopted this tree as his favourite; cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.452–565; Hyg. *Fab.* 203; Parth. *Erot.* 14 Westermann; Grimal, *Mitología*, pp. 124–125; Ruiz de Elvira, *Mitología clásica*, p. 446.

Note, too, that δάφνη means "laurel" in Greek, which undoubtedly smoothed the way for the daring transferal of the adjective *casta*. This bold poetic device, which lay in alluding to a fruit or plant by means of the corresponding mythological figure, was already familiar to the Hellenistic poets. It then became popular among the Romans from Catul. 64.290–291, *non sine . . . lentaque sorore / flammati Phaethontis* ("without forgetting the languid sister of Phaethon in flames", that is, "the daughter of Helios", or "the poplar"). The sisters of Phaethon and daughters of Helios, the Heliades, when their brother was struck down by Jupiter for having allowed the horses of the Sun to bolt, and causing the world to go on fire, were transformed by grief into poplars, to stand weeping for him on the banks of the Po. For the use of the proper name *Daphne* as fully equivalent to *laurus*, cf. Petr. *Satyr.* 131.8, l. 2, *bacis redimita Daphne.* Heyne also suggested the possibility that *casta* may be a reference to the poets, who receive laurel as a prize in poetic contests. He was undoubtedly influenced by the *casto . . . poetae* of l. 43.

The combination *casta lauro* is an *unicum*, and also a daring metonym; this fact, combined with the proximity of *casto* (l. 43), and in view of the paralell phrase *sacra laurus* coined by Virgil (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.81, [*Phoebi sacerdos*] *vittis et* ***sacra*** *redimitus tempora lauro*; 7.59–60), suggests that perhaps we ought to read *sacra* here too, in accordance with the Virgilian model and in view of the frequency of the phrase *sacra laurus* in Augustan poetry (cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.4.18–19, *sacra / lauro*; Tib. 2.5.63, *sacras . . . laurus* [with Murgatroyd 205]; Luc. *Civ.* 1.287, *sacras poscunt Capitolia laurus*). Nevertheless, *casta . . . lauro* cannot be rejected outright, as the memory of the nymph Daphne was always closely linked to the laurel in the imagination of the poets, as is demonstrated by Ov. *Ponto* 2.2.79–80, *ipse* (*Caesar*) . . . *tempora Phoebea virgine nexa tulit*; Petr. *Satyr.* 131.8, l. 2 (*sup. cit.*) and Val.-Flac. 1.386 (of the seer

Mopsus), *in summo laurus Peneïa* (= Daphne, daughter of Peneus) *cono*.

redimitus: the verb *redimire* is rare in all forms except the middle-passive perfect participle *redimitus*, and even this is not very frequent; never in Horace, Propertius or Lucan; once in Lucr. (5.1399, *redimire*); in Verg. 3 times (*Ge.* 1.349; *Aen.* 3.81; 10.538; cf. [Verg.] *Copa* 1); Ov. 14: *Am.* 3 (1.11.25; 3.10.3; 11.29), *Her.* 2 (6.115; 9.63), *Met.* 3 (9.3; 14.654), *Fasti* 6 (1.711; 3.269; 4.661; 5.79; 6.321; 6.483); Tib. 1 (1.7.45 *redimita*). In Lygdamus it reappears in 4.87 *redimitus*.

tempora lauro: the same phrase at the end of a hexameter appears in Verg. *Aen.* 3.81 and Tib. 2.5.5 (both *sup. cit.*). For the close connection between laurel and the temples, cf. Stat. *Silv.* 4.6.98, *amantis tempora laurus*.

tempora: "the temples"; 'proprie est pars capitis utrimque inter oculos et aures' (Forcellini 6.48–49).

lauro: because of its evergreen foliage, the laurel symbolizes eternity, and therefore fits in well with the image of an ever-young Apollo. Apollo as a deity "bedecked in laurel" is clearly described by his epithets δαφνηφόρος (Paus. 9.10.4; *IG* 1.2[9].210), δαφναῖος (*AP* 9.477; Nonn. *D.* 13.82), δαφνογηθής (*AP* 9.525.5), δαφνοκόμης (Opp. *C.* 1.365; *AP* 9.505.11), δαφνοπώλης (Ar. *Fr.* 764) ο δαφνίτης (Hsch.) in Greek, and *lauriger* (Ov. *Ars* 3.389; Mart. 9.28.9; *ThLL* 7.2.1059.32–38), *lauripotens* (Capel. 1.24) in Latin. "From the prophetic laurel", ἐκ δάφνης, Apollo issues his oracles; cf. *h. Ap.* 396; Call. *Del.* 94; A. *fr.* 394; Ar. *Pl.* 213. For the laurel as symbol and attribute of Apollo, see M. B. Ogle, "Laurel in Ancient Religion and Folk-Lore", *AJPh* 31 (1910) 304–307; Steier, "Lorbeer", *RE* 13.2 (1927) 1439.58 ff. ("Der Lorbeer im Kult und Volksglauben"). As Apollo was the god of inspiration, his plant became the symbol of both prophecy and poetry. The poets wore a laurel wreath round their heads; cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.30.15–16, *mihi Delphica / lauro cinge volens, Melpomene, comam*; Ov. *Ars* 2.495–496, *sacris induta capillis / laurus erat: vates ille videndus adit*; Ogle, *art. cit*, pp. 306–307.

For the double form *lauro/lauru* in the ablative, cf. *ThLL* 7.2.1060.41–51; *lauro* is the more frequent; *lauru*, however, appears in Hor. *Od.* 2.7.19; Ov. *Met.* 14.720; Tac. *Hist.* 2.55; Val.-Max. 2.2.3; Sen. *Ag.* 779.

24 est visus: scil. *mihi*, "appeared to me". A personal construction, equivalent to *visum est mihi iuvenem* . . . As regards *videor*, this is the usual introductory verb in a description of dream visions; cf. Enn. *Ann.* 5–6 V² (= 2–3 Sk.), *sommno leni placidoque revinctus / visus Homerus adesse poeta* (cf. what Cicero has to say about this phrase and the

accuracy of dreams in *Ac.* 4.16); Pl. *Mil.* 389, *arguere in somnis me meus mihi familiaris visust*; *Merc.* 228–229 (Demipho recounting a dream), *in somnis . . . / mercari visus mihi sum formosam capram*; *Curc.* 260–261, *hac nocte in somnis visus sum viderier, / procul sedere longe a me Aesculapium*; Verg. *Aen.* 2.270–271, *in somnis, ecce, ante oculos maestissimus Hector / visus adesse mihi*; 3.150–151, (*Penates*) *visi ante oculos adstare iacentis / in somnis*; 4.467; 5.722; 8.33; Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.32–33, *vetuit me . . . Quirinus / post mediam noctem visus, cum somnia vera*; Ov. *Met.* 7.634–637, *nox subit, et curis exercita corpora somnus / occupat: ante oculos eadem mihi quercus adesse / . . . / . . . visa est*; 11.672–673 (dream of Alcyone), (*Morpheus, Ceycis sumpta figura*) *fletus . . . fundere veros / visus erat*; 15.32, *visus adesse idem deus* (*nox*, l. 31); 651–653, *in somnis . . . visus.* But it is Propertius who goes furthest in his use of the formula *visum est*; in this author, the expression is capable in itself of introducing visions of the night—in the full sense of "to dream, to see in dreams"—with no need for a previous oneiric setting; cf. Prop. 3.3.1, *visus eram . . .* (I dreamed . . .); 4.7.3, *Cynthia namque meo visa est incumbere fulcro.* Note its presence also in the model: Ov. *Her.* 19.200, (*delphina*) *cernere non dubia sum mihi visa fide.*

nostra . . . sede: "in my home"; the term *sedes* appears to have a sense approaching "ancestral home" or "family property"; cf. Cic. *Fam.* 4.8.2, *quae est domestica sede iocundior?*; Catul. 67.4, *cum sedes ipse senex tenuit*; Verg. *Aen.* 4.10, *quis novus hic nostris successit sedibus hospes . . .!*; Tib. 1.10.18, *sic veteris sedes incoluistis avi*; 2.4.53, *quin etiam sedes iubeat si vendere avitas*; *OLD sedes* 4a.

ponere . . . pedem: "to step"; cf. Tib. 1.2.20, (*docet*) *illa* (scil. *Venus*) *pedem nullo ponere posse sono.* The expression is familiar in the field of dream visions from as early as Lucr. 4.318, *indugredi . . . pariter simulacra* (= reflections in the mirror) *pedemque ponere nobiscum credas* ("you might think that reflections move and walk along with us"). Here, however, in the sense of "to step into a place = to turn up, to appear somewhere" which the expression acquires in Cicero (cf. Cic. *Verr.* 1.62, *ecquo in oppido pedem posuit ubi non . . . stuprorum flagitiorumque suorum . . . vestigia eliquerit*; *Caec.* 31, *si in fundo pedem posuisse*), a meaning already attested in elegy prior to Lygdamus (cf. Prop. 2.32.48, *hic posuit nostra nuper in urbe pedem*); cf. also *Paneg. Mess.* 13, (*Alcides*) *laeta Molorcheis posuit vestigia tectis.*

25–38: detailed description of the physical appearance of Apollo. Even though he is a god of many facets, "Apollo has always been represented in the same way, as a young man of ideal beauty, with

powerful body, broad chest and slender hips. His beardless face, with its delicate lines under an imposing forehead, is framed in a long, thick head of hair which at times falls loose down his back and at other times is plaited, leaving a few locks free on his shoulders. He is generally depicted naked or at most wearing a simple chlamys, thrown back. Sometimes, especially when it is his 'musical' image that is being presented, he is draped in a long tunic" (cf. F. Guirand, *Mitología General*, p. 152). Apart from the possible stimulus of the plastic arts, among the closest literary models for these lines are two passages of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Firstly, the description of the physical appearance of Apollo on the occasion of a musical contest with Pan (*Met.* 11.165–168):

Ille caput flavum lauro Parnaside vinctus
verrit humum Tyrio saturata murice palla
instrictamque fidem gemmis et dentibus Indis
sustinet a laeva; tenuit manus altera plectrum.

Secondly, the description of the boyish beauty of Narcissus, compared explicitly with that of Apollo (*Met.* 3.420–423; 482–485):

Spectat humi positus geminum, sua lumina, sidus
et dignos Baccho, dignos et Apolline crines
impubesque genas et eburnea colla decusque
oris et in niveo mixtum candore ruborem.

Pectora traxerunt roseum percussa ruborem,
non aliter quam poma solent, qua candida parte,
parte rubent, aut ut variis solet uva racemis
ducere purpureum nondum matura colorem.

To these can be added Statius' description of the *puerile decus* of Ganymedes in *Silv.* 3.4.26 ff.

The beauty of Apollo is thus the androgynous beauty of the *pueri delicati*: long ringleted hair, beardless face, smooth cheeks and a pinkish-white complexion; that is, exactly the same as the elegiac beloved (eg Ov. *Am.* 3.3.3–6, *quam longos habuit nondum periura capillos, / tam longos, postquam numina laesit, habet. / Candida, candorem roseo suffusa rubore, / ante fuit: niveo lucet in ore rubor*; on the elegiac poets' ideal of female beauty, see T. J. Leary, "That's what little girls are made of: the physical charms of elegiac women", *LCM* 15.10 [Dec. 1990] 152–155). Lygdamus also adds the characteristic attire of Apollo Citharoedus: long cloak, lyre in his left hand and plectrum in his right.

All the descriptions of Apollo's youthful and exuberant beauty, his

delicate features and his sumptuous attire ultimately go back to Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo* (*Ap.* 32–42), the mark of which is first clearly seen among the elegiac poets in the image of Apollo which Tibullus offers us in 2.2 (cf. L. A. de Cuenca, "Imagen de Apolo en Calímaco [himno II] y en Tibulo [II.5]", *Emerita* 51 [1983] 135–142); for a sarcastic description, cf. Apul. *Flor.* 3 (= p. 4.16 Helm).

For the obvious echoes of Ovid in this passage, cf. Axelson, "Lygd. & Ov.", pp. 99–101; Büchner, "Lygdamus", pp. 107–111.

Observe, too, the wide range of colours used in Lygdamus' description, and how his physical portrayal of Apollo follows the rules of ancient rhetoric for the ἔκφρασις προσώπου, that is, the description of the individual from head to toe; cf. Aphth. *Prog.* p. 37.9 ff. Rabe, ἐκφράζοντας . . . δεῖ πρόσωπα μὲν ἀπο τῶν πρώτων ἐπι τὰ τελευταῖα ἰέναι, τουτέστιν ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς ἐπὶ πόδας; Nicol. *Prog.* p. 69.12 ff. Felten; Kost 224 ff. *ad* Musae. 55–66; Kenney *ad* [Verg.] *Mor.* 32 ff. Examples of this description from the head down are *AP* 5.204 (Mel.); Hor. *Epod.* 8.3–10; Ov. *Am.* 1.5.19–22 (with McKeown 116–117); 3.1.7–14; 3.3–10; Mart. 3.53; [Lucian.] *Am.* 14; Aus. *Ep.* 14.44 ff. pp. 246–247 Peiper.

25–26: this distich has come down to us in corrupted form. The unanimous reading of the mss. *non illo quicquam formosius ulla priorum / aetas humanum nec videt illud opus* cannot be maintained. However, the content of these two lines can easily be surmised: the beauty of the apparition surpasses human measure. Numerous proposals have been made to restore the original distich. The best of them is still *non vidit quicquam formosius ulla priorum / aetas, humanum nec fuit illud opus* (Heyne). For the second member ("nor was it the work of human hand"), cf. Just. 12.16.2, *qua nocte eum* (scil. *Alexandrum*) *mater Olympias concepit, visa per quietem est cum ingenti serpente volutari, nec decepta somnio est; nam profecto maius humana mortalitate opus utero tulit.* Lachmann's proposal, *non illo quicquam formosius ulla priorum / aetas, heroum nec tulit ulla domus* (cf. Prop. 1.4.5 ff., *tu licet Antiopae formam . . . et . . . Spartanae referas laudibus Hermionae, et quascumque tulit formosi temporis aetas, Cynthia non illas nomen habere sinat*; for *tulit domus*, cf. [Sen.] *Oct.* 930) is too daring, and the form of the pentameter in particular is considerably removed from the transmitted text. Baehrens, for his part, proposed *humanum nec tulit ille decus*; Postgate (*CQ* 6 [1912] 41–42), *humanum* (ie *hominum*) *nec videt ulla domus*; Cartault (followed by Tescari and Lee), *aetas, aut hominum nunc videt ulla domus*; Bignone (*RF* 38 [1910] 416–418), *aetas humanum nec tulit artis opus*; Tescari (*Convivium* 1938, p. 237), *aetas aut hominum nunc videt artis opus*, although in his 1951

edition he followed Cartault. For the phraseology, cf. Stat. *Silv.* 3.4.39–40, *nil ego, nil, fateor, toto tam dulce sub orbe / aut vidi aut genui*, and Ov. *Am.* 1.5.23 (after a detailed description of the beauty of the naked Corinna), *nil non laudabile vidi*; *Met.* 3.609–610, *specto cultum faciemque gradumque* (scil. *Bacchi*): / *nil ibi, quod credi posset mortale, videbam.*

The beauty of Apollo became proverbial, as is shown by the use of the adjective *Apollineus*, "of a beauty worthy of Apollo"; cf. Mart. 6.29.6, *quis Apollineo pulchrior ore fuit?*; *CIL* 13.6808, *decora facie cupidinis os . . . gerens nec metuam dicere Apollineus.* In this respect, note also *Aen.* 4.141–150, where Virgil describes the Apollonian beauty of Aeneas (*ipse ante alios pulcherrimus omnis / infert se . . . Aeneas . . .*, / *qualis ubi . . . Apollo . . .*).

25 formosius: on the poetic use of the adjective *formosus* and its connotations of sexual attraction, see the commentary on Lygd. 1.7 *formosae*. Among the Augustan poets, Apollo is described as *formosus* in Verg. *Ecl.* 4.57 and Tib. 2.3.11; and as *pulcher* in Verg. *Aen.* 3.119; Fontenrose II 454–455.

priorum: ie *maiorum*, *veterum*; cf. Ver. *Ge.* 3.292; *Aen.* 3.693, *dixere priores*; Ov. *Met.* 10.218, *more priorum*; *OLD prior* 3b.

26 opus: for the term, cf. Lygd. 1.14 (comm.); 4.37 (comm.). The frequent use of this word to denote a work of art wrongly led Herrmann to place this distich after l. 38, making it refer to Apollo's cithara.

27 intonsi crines: flowing locks are characteristic of the physical appearance of Apollo, Φοῖβος ἀκερσεκόμης (first in Hom. *Il.* 20.39; cf. *h. Ap.* 134; Pi. *I.* 1.7; *AP* 9.525.2). The allusion to the long hair of this god, and of Bacchus, with whom Apollo shares this striking physical characteristic, is a commonplace, as the symbol of the eternal youth and beauty of both; for Apollo, cf. also *h. Ap.* 449–450, ἀνέρι εἰδόμενος αἰζηῷ τε / πρωθήβῃ, χαίτῃς εἰλυμένος εὐρέας ὤμους; A. R. 2.708–709, αἰεί τοι, ἄναξ, ἄτμητοι ἔθειραι, / αἰὲν ἀδήλητοι; Enn. *Scen.* 31, *crinitus Apollo* (= Verg. *Aen.* 9.638; *CLE* 271.2; Hyg. *Fab.* 9 p. 42.7; Schol. Hor. *Od.* 1.21.2; *ThLL* 4.1205.43–45); Hor. *Od.* 1.21.2, *intonsum . . . Cynthium* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 255); 3.4.62, *crinis solutos* (scil. *Phoebi*); *Epod.* 15.9, *intonsos . . . agitare Apollinis aura capillos*; Tib. 2.3.12, *intonsae . . . comae* (scil. *Apollinis*); and 26, *Phoebi . . . comam*; 2.5.8, *longas nunc bene pecte* (scil. *Phoebe*) *comas*, and 121, *sic tibi sint intonsi, Phoebe, capilli*; [Tib.] 3.10.2, *huc ades, intonsa Phoebe superbe coma*; Prop. 3.13.52, *intonsi . . . dei* (with note by Fedeli 440); 4.6.31, *non ille* (scil. *Phoebus*) *attulerat crines in colla solutos*; Ov. *Met.* 1.450–451;

564 (Apollo to Daphne), *meum intonsis caput est iuvenale capillis* (with Bömer 175); 12.585, *intonsum . . . Sminthea*; *Tr.* 3.1.60, *ducor ad intonsi candida templa dei* (scil. *Phoebi*); *Priap.* 36.2; Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.2, *umeroque comanti*; 3.4.8, *intonso . . . patri* (with Laguna 313); Apul. *Flor.* 3 (= p. 4.16 Helm), *Apollo . . . coma intonsus*; Fontenrose I 443; II 454; on the beauty of Apollo's hair, cf. also Hor. *Od.* 4.6.26, *Phoebe, qui Xantho lavis amne crinis*; Ov. *Am.* 1.1.11, *crinibus insignem* (with McKeown 19; a phrase which reappears in Stat. *Theb.* 9.758; *Fasti* 2.106; for Bacchus, cf. *AP* 9.542.15, ξανθοκάρηνος; 11.409.3, εὐχαίτης; Nonn. *D.* 15.49, ἀκερσίκομος; 16.172, ἁβροκόμης; 18.168, εὐχαίτης; Ov. *Met.* 4.13, *indetonsusque Thyoneus*; 17–18, *tibi* (= *Baccho*) . . . *inconsumpta iuventa est, / tu puer aeternus, tu formosissimus*; *Ponto* 2.9.31, *intonso . . . Baccho*; Sen. *Phaed.* 754, *intonsa iuvenis perpetuum coma* (scil. *Bacche*); cf. also *ThLL* 7.2.29.57 ff. Sometimes both gods are referred to together; cf. Tib. 1.4.37–38, *solis aeterna est Baccho Phoeboque iuventas, / nam decet* **intonsus crinis** *utrumque deum* (with Murgatroyd 144; cf. H. Musurillo, *TAPhA* 98 [1967] 260–261); Martial even takes the liberty of making play of a supposed rivalry between the two gods as to which one has the longest locks, in 4.45.7–8, *perpetuo sic flore mices, sic denique non sint / tam longae Bromio* (= *Baccho*) *quam tibi, Phoebe, comae.* The beauty of Apollo's and Bacchus' hair did in fact become proverbial; cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.14.31–32, *formosae periere comae, quas vellet Apollo, / quas vellet capiti Bacchus inesse suo*; *Met.* 3.421 (of Narcissus), *dignos Baccho, dignos et Apolline crines* (with Bömer 554–555); Petr. *Satyr.* 109.10, *infelix, modo crinibus nitebas / Phoebo pulchrior et sorore Phoebi.*

It is quite striking in this connection that Apollo (or Bacchus) should be taken as a point of reference against which to judge female beauty or that of a *puer delicatus*, given the androgynous nature of their good looks; cf. on this point, in addition to Ov. *Am.* 1.14.31–32, where the poet compares the hair of his beloved with that of the god, *Ars* 3.141–142 (advice to women on different hair-styles), *alterius crines umero iactentur utroque: / talis es adsumpta, Phoebe canore, lyra.* For long, perfumed hair as a feature of *pueri delicati* (or *capillati*), cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.29.8 and 2.5.23 (with Nisbet-Hubbard I 341 and II 92); *Epod.* 2.28; Petr. *Satyr.* 27.1–2; 29.3; 57.9; 63.3–4; 70.8; Vollmer *ad* Stat. *Silv.* 3.4.8; Mart. 2.57.5; 3.58.30–31, *lascivi / . . . capillati*; 9.16.6, *Ganymedes . . . comas*; Philo *Vita* 51; Gr. Naz. *Or.* 14(=16).17, παῖδας δὲ παρεστάναι, τοὺς μὲν ἐν κόσμῳ καὶ ἐφεξῆς, ἀνέτους τὰς κόμας καὶ θηλυδρίας καὶ τῇ κατὰ πρόσωπον κουρᾷ περιειργασμένους, πλεῖον ἢ ὅσον συμφέρει λίχνοις ὀφθαλμοῖς κεκοσμημένους; Blümner, *Römische Privataltertümer* 271 and 396 n. 10;

Howell 171–172 *ad* Mart. 1.31. In Greece it was the practice to cut a boy's hair on his coming of age, the first haircut thus marking the transition from παῖς to ἔφηβος (Pamphilus *ap.* Athen. 11.494F; Eust. *Il.* 23.141; *AP* 6.279 [Euph.] with Gow-Page, *Anthologia Graeca* II, p. 285; Steininger, "Haartracht und Haarschmuck", *RE* 7.2 [1912] 2118), so that long, uncut hair could be regarded on the literary level as a symbol of eternal youth (cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.564; Sen. *Phaed.* 754; Laguna 332 *ad* Stat. *Silv.* 3.4.78). In other contexts, however, long hair worn loose is the symbol of grief and mourning, or of the rustic ways of the ancient Romans (*maiores*) or foreign barbarians, or even characteristic of mythical heroes. For the androgynous image of Apollo, note Hor. *Od.* 4.6.28, where the poet rounds off the physical description of Apollo as a *puer delicatus* by describing him as *lēvis* ("smooth-faced, beardless"). As regards the colour of Apollo's hair, although there is no express mention of it here, it should be noted that from Homer onwards, gods and heroes are fair-haired (Pease 471–473 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 4.590, with numerous *loci*; Fordyce 287 *ad* Catul. 64.63; Bömer 414 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.749; J. S. Lasso de la Vega, "El amor dorio", *El descubrimiento del amor en Grecia* [Madrid 1959] 95); for the "fair" Apollo, cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.15.35, *flavus Apollo* (= Stat. *Theb.* 1.698; *ThLL* 6.888.48 ff.); *Met.* 11.165, *caput flavum*; Claud. *Carm. min.* 27.55; comparable epithets such as ξανθός, χρυσοκόμης, χρυσοῦς, χρυσοχαίτης are applied to him in Greek; cf. Tyrt. *Frg.* 3a.2 Diehl; Alc. 304.1 L.-P.; Pi. *Io.* 887–888; *O.* 6.41; 7.32; *P.* 2.16; 9.5; B. *Epigr.* 4.2; E. *Supp.* 975–976; *Tr.* 253–254; *IT* 1237; Ar. *Av.* 216; A. R. 2.676–677; Apollod. *FGrHist* 244 F 98 [47] p. 1058 Jacoby; for fair hair as the elegists' ideal of female beauty, cf. T. J. Leary, "That's what little girls are made of: the physical charms of elegiac women", *LCM* 15.10 (Dec. 1990) 153.

The phrase *intonsi crines* is extremely highflown in style, given that *intonsus* is an almost exclusively poetic word from Accius onwards (cf. *ThLL* 7.2.29.52) and that of all the terms used in Latin poetry for "hair, locks" (*capillus, coma, crines*) *crines* is the most elevated and therefore the least frequent in elegy (on this point, see the commentary on Lygd. 1.10 *coma*).

longa cervice: "slender, graceful neck"; cf. Prop. 3.17.31, */levis ... cervix*, "delicate neck". "A small breast with sloping shoulders and **a graceful neck** were most admired" in women, according to Leary, *art. cit.*, p. 154. For the adjective *longus* in the sense of "slim, slender", cf. Catul. 86.1, *Quintia ... candida, longa, recta est.* There was

also the expression *crassa* or *tanta cervix* to indicate the coarseness or insensitivity of an individual (cf. Cic. *Verr.* 3.135, *qui tantis erunt cervicibus recuperatores qui audeant ... contra voluntatem eius ... iudicare?*; Sen. *Contr.* 3.pr.16, *scholasti intueri me, quis essem, qui tam crassas cervices haberem*; *OLD cervix* 2f); 'e contrario', then, a *longa cervix* was a graceful neck. On the unmanliness of this type of neck, cf. Juv. 3.88 (on the adulator), *et longum invalidi collum cervicibus aequat / Herculis, Antaeum procul a tellure tenentis.* The phrase reappears only in Plin. *Nat.* 19.107, *getium* (or *gethyum*, "spring onion") *paene sine capite est, cervicis tantum longae.* This is the only occurrence of the word in the whole of the *Corp. Tib.*; Tibullus always uses *collum* (1.2.92; 4.16; 56; 7.52; 8.38; 2.6.2). Compliments centering on the neck are generally connected with its snow-white colour: *eburnea cervix* in Ov. *Her.* 20.59; *candida cervix* in Hor. *Od.* 3.9.2–3; Juv. 10.345; *lactea cervix* in Verg. *Aen.* 10.137; Apul. *Met.* 5.22; *nivea cervix* in Ov. *Am.* 2.4.41; *Met.* 10.272; Manil. 5.554; *marmorea cervix* in Verg. *Ge.* 4.523; Petr. *Satyr.* 131; occasionally rosy (cf. *rosea cervix* in Verg. *Aen.* 1.402; Hor. *Od.* 1.13.2); cf. *ThLL* 3.950.16–32.

fluebant: "flowed". Virgil had already used the same verb to give a poetic description of the flowing locks of this god; cf. *Aen.* 4.147–148, (*Apollo*) *mollique fluentem / fronde premit crinem fingens atque implicat auro.* Unlike in Virgil, however, Apollo here does not wear his hair tied back; rather, at most held only by the laurel round his head (l. 23), it falls free down his neck and over both shoulders, the very "Apollo Citharoedus style" Ovid recommended to certain women: *alterius crines umero iactentur utroque: / talis es adsumpta, Phoebe canore, lyra* (*Ars* 3.141–142). Virgil's Apollo with tied-back hair is Apollo Hecatebolos, the archer-god with the infallible shot (*tela sonant umeris*, 149), an image with which Virgil deliberately rounds off the comparison between Aeneas and Apollo, since this image of the warrior god is more in tune with the manly beauty of the hero Aeneas. For the use of the verb *fluere* applied to hair flowing backwards in waves because of the wind, see Stat. *Theb.* 6.612, *occursu Zephyri retro fluit* (*crinis*).

28 stillabat Syrio myrrhea rore coma: in all places and periods, miraculous apparitions are proverbially accompanied by the smell of perfumes and fragrances; cf. eg Verg. *Aen.* 1.403–404 (Venus appearing to Aeneas), *ambrosiaeque comae divinum vertice odorem / spiravere*; Prop. 3.17.31, *levis odorato cervix manavit olivo.* As early as Call. *Ap.* 38 the hair of Apollo scatters aromatic essences on the ground (αἱ δὲ κόμαι θυόεντα πέδῳ λείβουσιν ἔλαια), although the poet himself points

out that these are not perfumes, but the panacea itself (ll. 39–41). There is nothing of this in Lygdamus, where the detail of the perfumed hair seems to stem more from the poet's deliberate intention to draw a portrait of Apollo as a *puer delicatus*. For hair perfumed with myrrh as an eastern custom and a symbol of effeminacy (except in *symposia*: cf. Lygd. 6.63–64), cf. eg Verg. *Aen.* 4.215–217, *Paris cum semiviro comitatu, / Maeonia mentum mitra crinemque madentem / subnexus* (with Austin 78); 12.99–100 (Turnus displaying contempt for Aeneas as an effeminate Oriental), *corpus ... semiviri Phrygis et foedare in pulvere crinis vibratos calido ferro murraque madentis*; Ov. *Met.* 3.554–555 (on the Thebans), *neque bella iuvant nec tela nec usus equorum, / sed madidus murra crinis mollesque coronae / purpuraque et pictis intextum vestibus aurum*; 5.52–53 (on the Indian Attis), *ornabant ... monilia collum et madidos murra curvum crinale capillos*; Val.-Flac. 8.347; Sen. *Herc. O.* 376, *hirtam Sabaea marcidus myrrha comam*; Steier, *RE* 16.1143.41 ff.; *ThLL* 8.1681.44 ff. In satire, perfumed hair is also a mark of the dandy and *bon vivant* (eg Mart. 2.29.5; 11.39.11; Juv. 2.41; *i.a.*). In his description of the goddess *Voluptas*, Silius Italicus says: *Achemenium spirabat vertice odorem, / ambrosias diffusa comas* (*Pun.* 15.23–24). Cf. Lilja, *Odours*, pp. 86 ff., and, on dandyism in general, E. Eyben, *De Jonge Romein* (1977) 180 ff.

For the phraseology, see Prop. 3.17.31 (of Bacchus), *levis odorato cervix manabit olivo* (cf. E. *Ba.* 235); Tib. 1.7.51, *illius* (scil. *Osiris*) *et nitido stillent unguenta capillo*; 2.2.7, *illius* (scil. *Genii*) *puro destillent tempora nardo*; Ov. *Met.* 10.501, *stillataque robore myrrha*; 11.57, *sparsos stillanti rore capillos* (scil. *Orphei*); Luc. *Civ.* 7.837, *omnis ... sanguineis stillavit roribus arbor.* Fabricius, perhaps correctly, put forward the reading *spirabat*, "exhaled <an aroma>", as in Verg. *Aen.* 1.403, cited above. Broukhusius, though rejecting this reading, stated that he had seen it in one of the mss.; on the other hand, it is accepted by some of the older editors (*ed. Plantiniana* 1569, Passeratius, Voss, Heyne-Wunderlich, Bach). The use of *spirare* as an equivalent in itself to *exhalare*, without *odorem*, is late; cf. Sil. 15.23 (*sup. cit.*); Mart. 11.8.1, *quod ... spirant opobalsama*; Juv. 2.41; 6.463, *spirent cinnama*; Val.-Flac. 6.129, *odorato spirante crine.* For an intransitive use of *spirare* with the ablative, see Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.211, *semper odoratis spirabunt floribus arae.* For the formulation of the line, compare the close parallelism with its likely model, Ov. *Her.* 15.76 (*Sappho Phaoni*), *non Arabo noster* **rore** *capillus olet.*

stillabat: the combination of *stillare* with the ablative of separation or the prepositional use with *de* is normal in all periods of Latin (*OLD stillo* 2). The transitive construction, on the other hand, is only

attested from Hor. *Poet.* 428–429, *clamabit* . . ., *super his* . . . *stillabit amicis ex oculis rorem*; Bömer 333 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.364; Juv. 3.122–123, *stillavit* . . . *exiguum de* . . . *veneno*; *OLD stillo* 3a.

Syrio . . . rore: the East, in particular Syria and Arabia, was the source of most of the favourite perfumes of the fashionable young people of Rome: *stacte*, *malobathrum*, *balsamum* (cf. Lygd. 2.23–24 [comm.]). Here Lygdamus may be referring to malobathrum, an aromatic oil or essence extracted from the tree of the same name in India, Syria and Egypt. On *malobathrum*, cf. Nisbet-Hubbard 112 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 2.7.7–8, *coronatus nitentis / malobathro Syrio capillos*. Pliny the Elder (*Nat.* 12.129) mentions a Syrian variety of *malobathrum*, more fertile than the Aegyptian, although he notes that the best come from India: *dat et malobathrum Syria, arborem folio convoluto, colore aridi folii, ex quo premitur oleum ad unguenta, fertiliore eiusdem Aegypto; laudatius tamen ex India venit* (cf. also *Nat.* 14.108). Or perhaps, as Vulpius suggested, the reference here is to nard (cf. Lygd. 6.63, *Syrio* . . . *nardo*). The aromatic properties of this flower are mentioned by Lucr. 2.848, *nardi florem, nectar qui naribus halat*. On nard as a perfume, cf. Varro *Men.* 480, *trossuli nardo nitidi*; Hor. *Od.* 2.11.16–17, *Assyriaque nardo / . . . uncti?* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 175); Tib. 2.2.7, *illius puro destillent tempora nardo*. On Syrian nard, cf. Dsc. 1.7.1, νάρδου ἐστὶ γένη δύο· ἡ μὲν γάρ τις καλεῖται Ἰνδική, ἡ δὲ Συριακή· οὐχ ὅτι ἐν Συρίᾳ εὑρίσκεται, ἀλλ' ὅτι τοῦ ὄρους ἐν ᾧ γεννᾶται τὸ μὲν πρὸς Συπίαν τέτραπται τὸ δὲ πρὸς Ἰνδούς; Plin. *Nat.* 12.45 (distinguishing Syrian nard from the Indian, Gallic and Cretan varieties). For the formulation, cf. Catul. 6.8, *Syrio fragrans olivo*.

Syrio: the reading *Syrio* seems clear, as against the *Tyrio* of the mss. (more appropriate for purple). It should be noted that *Syrius* can refer *lato sensu* to any product from the Far East. In fact, 'Syrian' was a conventional epithet for perfume in general; cf. Theocr. 15.114; Mel. *AP* 4.1.43; Phld. *AP* 11.34.2; Hor. *Od.* 2.7.8 (with Nisbet-Hubbard 112); Prop. 1.2.3; Athen. 15.689a. A similar use in connection with perfumes occurs with the variant *Assyrius*, a poetically more elevated term; cf. Catul. 68.144 (with Fordyce 359–360); Hor. *Od.* 2.11.16 (with Nisbet-Hubbard 175); Verg. *Ecl.* 4.25; Tib. 1.3.7.

myrrhea: "perfumed with myrrh" or "the colour of myrrh (light chestnut)". The ms. reading *myrtea* does not seem to be the original one, either in its repeatedly attested sense of "made of myrtle"—in fact always applied to the garlands and not to the hair itself (cf. Tib. 1.3.66 *et gerit insigni myrtea serta coma*; Ov. *Ars* 2.734, *sertaque odorate myrtea ferte comae*; Val.-Max. 3.6.5; Gell. 5.6.20)—, in view of *redimitus* . . .

lauro (l. 23), or as "the colour of myrtle", that is, dark green like the leaves or brown like the bark (cf. Dar. 13 p. 16.12, *Achillem . . . capillo myrteo*), since traditionally Apollo was considered to be fair (χρυσοκόμης for the Greek poets from Pi. *O.* 6.41; 7.32; *flavus* for the Romans from Ov. *Am.* 1.15.35). Consequently, the proposal put forward by Muretus *murrea*, "the colour of myrrh", the reading of all the *recentiores*, does not seem unreasonable. This use of the adjective *murreus* to refer to hair colour is attested in Latin literature in Hor. *Od.* 3.14.21–22, *dic . . . properet Neaerae / murreum nodo cohibire crinem*, on which passage Porphyrio observes: *colorem murreum in crinibus hodieque dicunt, qui medius est inter flavum et nigrum*. That is, a dark chestnut colour; cf. Némethy 58–59 (cf. also, *id.*, "Horatiana", *RhM* 61 [1906] 139). Moreover, the corruption of *murreus* into *myrteus* can easily be envisaged if we bear in mind the frequent confusion of *murra* (or *myrra*) and *myrta* in the mss. (cf. *ThLL* 8.1681.2 s.v. murra [E. Baer]).

Myrrh, Gr. σμύρνα, is the aromatic, medicinal gum resin obtained from the *Balsamodendron myrrha*, a thorny shrub grown mainly in Africa, particularly in Somalia (the ancient land of Punt), although in Antiquity this aromatic plant is almost always associated with Arabia, known as the land of myrrh (cf. Hdt. 3.107; Thphr. *Plant.* 9.4.2–9; Plin. *Nat.* 12.66: *RE* 16.1134–1146; André, *Botanique*, p. 215; H. N. & A. L. Moldenke, *Plants of the Bible* [1952] 82–84). The Romans were familiar with myrrh of varying qualities, and adulterating it was a profitable form of fraud; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 12.66 ff.; Miller, *Spice Trade*, pp. 104–5.

rore: strictly speaking, *ros* denotes the "morning dew", here equivalent to "perfume", but perhaps used deliberately in connection with the hour of dawn when the apparition occurs. The use of *ros* in the sense of "sprinkled perfume" or "drops of perfume" is late, first in Ov. *Her.* 15.76 *sup. cit.*, then in Silver Latin; cf. Val.-Flac. 6.709, *rore Sabaeo*; Stat. *Theb.* 12.138, *arcanis roribus artus ambrosiaeque rigat sucis*; Apul. *Met.* 10.22, *labias . . . modicas ambroseo rore purpurantes*; *OLD ros* 4. Certainly from an earlier period, however, is the poetic use of *ros* to refer to water (cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.4.61–62, [*Phoebus*] *qui rore puro Castaliae lavit / crinis solutos*; Verg. *Ge.* 1.385; *Aen.* 5.854, *ramum Lethaeo rore madentem*; 6.230), the dripping of blood (*OLD ros* 2c) or falling tears (*OLD ros* 2b). The varied use of the verb *roro* must also have exerted some influence. In fact, Ovid had already used *rorantes comas* (*Met.* 5.488) for dripping-wet hair and Apuleius uses it in connection with perfume (*Met.* 2.8, *Venus . . . balsama rorans*).

coma: on poetic terms for "hair", see comm. on Lygd. 1.10.
29–34: these three distichs (four similes) deal with the youthful appearance of the god, first—once more—his radiant beauty (l. 29), which Lygdamus compares to the brightness of the full moon; then the rosy colour of his skin (ll. 30–34), which compares to the complexion of a newly-wed bride, flushed with modesty (ll. 31–32), to the white lily and red amaranth (ll. 33–34) and to the autumnal apples (l. 34). The combination of *roseus color* and *candidus color* is aimed at suggesting the idea of splendour and luminosity. A similar mixture of *candor* and *pudor* to describe radiant physical beauty is found in Prop. 3.24.7–8, *et color est totiens roseo collatus Eoo, / cum tibi quaesitus candor in ore foret* (with Fedeli 679–680). To obviate the possible incoherence in the colours, it is sufficient to consider, in the first place, the rather imprecise boundaries between terms of colour in the Roman world (cf. André, *Termes de couleur*, pp. 31–38 and 111–113, stressing that in *candidus* "la sensation colorée s'efface devant la luminosité" [p. 32] and that where *roseus* occurs it is the idea of pale pink that predominates [p. 112]), as well as the fact that both colours, *candidus* and *purpureus* share the same poetic use in the sense of "beauty".
29 candor erat qualem praefert Latonia Luna: the comparison (simile) of radiant beauty with the brightness of the full moon is a topos of ancient literature. It is found as early as Sapph. *Frg.* 96.6 ff. L.-P. (a young woman eclipses all others as the full moon eclipses the other heavenly bodies; for this variant, cf. Ov. *Met.* 2.722–725; Nisbet-Hubbard 163–164 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 1.12.48) and, with the comparison concentrating, as here, on the brightness of the moon, in the Homeric hymn to Aphrodite (cf. *h. Ven.* 89, ὡς δὲ σελήνη στήθεσιν ἀμφ' ἁπαλοῖσιν ἐλάμπετο: "in her tender breast shone a kind of moon") and in Theocr. 2.79, Στήθεα δὲ στίλβοντα πολὺ πλέον ἢ τὺ Σελάνα. Among the Latins it is already in Hor. *Od.* 2.5.18–28, *Chloris albo sic umero nitens / ut pura nocturno renidet / luna mari* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 90). In Hor. *Od.* 2.11.10–11 (referring to fleeting beauty), (*non semper*) *uno luna rubens nitet voltu*, the image of a rose-coloured moon—a phenomenon that occurs before a storm or an eclipse (cf. Verg. *Ge.* 1.431; Ov. *Am.* 2.1.23; 5.38; *Met.* 4.332–333; 15.790; Fedeli 255 *ad* Prop. 1.10.8)—symbolizes youthful bashfulness (cf. Nisbet-Hubbard 172), as in Ov. *Met.* 4.329–333:

Naïs ab his tacuit. Pueri rubor ora notavit
(nescit enim, quid amor), sed et erubuisse decebat.
Hic color aprica pendentibus arbore pomis

aut ebori tincto est aut ***sub candore rubenti,***
cum frustra resonant aera auxiliaria, lunae.

For the "face" of the moon, cf. Verg. *Ge.* 1.430, *at si virgineum suffuderit ore ruborem, / ventus erit: vento semper rubet aurea Phoebe*; Ov. *Am.* 1.8.12, *purpureus Lunae sanguine vultus erat*; *Met.* 14.366–367, *carmine . . . / . . . niveae vultum confundere Lunae*; Col. *Rust.* 10.288–289, *Latonia Phoebe / purpureo radiat vultu*; Soph. *Frg.* 871.6 Pearson, Radt; Plut. *Mor.* 920B ff.; *ThLL* 9.2.1089.64 ff. For a hyperbolic comparison of beauty (generally female) with the brightness of the moon, cf. Ov. *Her.* 18.71–74; Sen. *Phaed.* 743; Val.-Flac. 3.558–559 (on Hylas leaning over a pool), *stagna vaga sic luce micant ubi Cynthia caelo / prospicit*; Corip. *Iust.* 2.72–73, *pulcherrima proles* (= Arabia, only surviving daughter of Justinus II and Sophia), */ luce sua plenam quae possit vincere lunam*; Nonn. *D.* 5.487–488 (on Artemis in her bath), φαίης δ' ὡς παρὰ χεῦμα παλίμπορον Ὠκεανοῖο / ἑσπερίη σελάγιζε δι' ὕδατος ὄμπνια Μήνη; 38.122 ff. (on Clymene swimming); as regards the sun, cf. Pl. *Men.* 181, *solem vides satin ut occaecatust prae huius corporis candoribus.* On the whiteness of the moon, cf. Cic. *Rep.* 1.23, *candens est plena luna*; Ov. *Her.* 18.61, *faveas, dea candida* (scil. *Luna*).

candor: in its double sense of "splendour", referring to the sun-god, and "beauty", given his youthful comeliness. Whiteness or paleness of the skin was considered a sign of beauty (cf. Varro *Men.* 432 [= *Sat.* 432 Büch.], *amiculam . . . proceram candidam teneram formosam*; the phrase *candida puella* is found in Catul. 13.4; 35.8 [with Fordyce 177]; Hor. *Epod.* 11.27; cf. Catul. 86.1, *candida, longa, recta est*; Ov. *Ars* 3.74, *nitido . . . ore*); for a pale complexion as an ideal of feminine beauty among the elegiac poets, cf. T. J. Leary, "That's what little girls are made of: the physical charms of elegiac women", *LCM* 15.10 (Dec. 1990) 153. In fact, *candida* (= *pulchra*) is a regular encomiastic epithet to describe heroines (eg Verg. *Aen.* 5.571, *candida Dido*; Ov. *Am.* 1.4.7; 2.18.29; *Met.* 2.349; 13.789; Prop. 2.28.51) and the elegiac beloved (eg Ov. *Am.* 1.7.40; 3.3.5; 7.8; cf. Pichon, p. 98); with reference to masculine beauty, cf. eg Varro *Men.* 462, *nitidi ephebi . . . candidi*; Hor. *Epod.* 3.9, *Iasonem praeter omnes candidum*; *Ep.* 2.2.4 (of a young slave for sale), *candidus et talos a vertice pulcher ad imos*; Verg. *Ecl.* 2.16; 5.56–57, *candidus . . . / . . . Daphnis* (Serv. *ad loc.*, *candidus id est pulcher*); [Verg.] *Priap.* 83.2; [Albinov.] *Obit.* 1.3; Mart. 11.22.1, *nivei . . . Galaesi* (with Kay 119). In contrast, a dark skin in love "sometimes needed apology, though there was no colour-bar" (Nisbet-Hubbard *ad* Hor. *Od.* 2.4.3 p. 70, citing Asclep. *AP* 5.210.3, εἰ δὲ μέλαινα, τί

τοῦτο; καὶ ἄνθρακες; Mel. *AP* 12.165; Phld. *AP* 5.121.1–2, μικκὴ ηαὶ μελανεῦσα Φιλαίνιον, ἀλλὰ σελίνων / οὐλοτέρη καὶ μνοῦ χρῶτα τερεινοτέρη; Lucr. 4.1160, *nigra melichrus est*; Verg. *Ecl.* 2.15 ff.; 10.38–39; Ov. *Ars* 2.643–644; *Rem.* 327; *Her.* 15.35–36, *candida si non sum* [scil. *Sappho*], *placuit Cepheia Perseo / Andromede, patriae fusca colore suae*; Mart. 1.115; 4.62; 7.13; 7.29.8, *nota tamen Marsi fusca Melainis erat*; Strato *AP* 12.5 and 244). In fact, among the Romans the term *candor* is a synonym for "beauty"; cf. Porph. *Epod.* 3.9, *candoris nomine et Vergilius in significatione pulchritudinis semper utitur*, and the examples quoted in *ThLL* 3.247.33 ff.; for *candidus* = *formosus*, cf. *ThLL* 3.241.10–46. Martial in 2.41.11 mocks those women who "whitewash" their faces in order to look paler. Artificial whiteners ranged from white-lead (*cerussa*; cf. Ov. *Medic.* 73; Mart. 1.72.6; 2.41.12; Plin. *Nat.* 34.176) and chalk (*creta*; cf. Hor. *Epod.* 12.10; Mart. 2.41.11; 8.33.17; 6.93.9) to more exotic substances like crocodile excrement (cf. Hor. *Epod.* 12.11; Forbes, *Technology* III, pp. 39–40); cf. T. J. Leary, "That's what little girls are made of: the physical charms of elegiac women", *LCM* 15.10 (Dec. 1990), p. 153. In addition, the Romans distinguished between the beautiful whiteness of a healthy skin (*candidus*) and a deathly, sickly pallor (*albus*); cf. Serv. *Ge.* 3.82: *aliud est candidum esse, id est quadam nitenti luce perfusum, alius album, quod pallori constat esse vicinum*; Mart. 1.55.14 (with Howell 240); 10.12.7–12; André, *Termes de couleur*, pp. 25–26. Among the gods, this whiteness of complexion, apart from Apollo (cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.2.30–32, *venias . . . nube candentis umeros amictus, augur Apollo*; Verg. *Aen.* 8.720, *candentis . . . Phoebi*; Val.-Flac. 3.481, *Phoebus candentior*; cf. also [Verg.] *Catal.* 9.1, *niveus Phoebus*;), was also characteristic of the equally youthful Bacchus (cf. Lygd. 6.1, *candide Liber ades*; Ov. *Fasti* 3.772, *candide Bacche*). It is striking that the splendour of the sun-god should be compared with that of the moon-goddess. Perhaps Lygdamus is attempting to play with the colour contrast between the two heavenly bodies, along the lines of [Verg.] *Cir.* 37, *purpureos inter solis et candida lunae sidera*.

praefert: *praeferre* ("to display, show, exhibit, manifest") is an appropriate verb in the present context for two reasons: first, it is generally used with *ore* or *vultu*, that is, it usually refers to the outward appearance of the face (cf. Manil. 4.721; Vell. 2.27.3, *Telesinus victoris magis quam moriens vultum praeferens*; Val.-Max. 2.6.14, *laetum praeferentibus vultum*; Sen. *Oed.* 509; Mart. 5.61.9, *procuratorem voltu qui praeferat ipso*), as it refers here to the face of the full moon (and by extension to the face of Apollo); and secondly, it frequently implies a lack of authen-

ticity, an attempt to give a false impression, in the face or in general (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 13.45, *modestiam praeferre et lascivia uti*; Curt. 7.2.24, *vultu laetitiae speciem praeferente* ['ad dissimulandum consilium mortis inferendae']), which recalls the borrowed light (*nothum lumen*) of the moon (cf. Catul. 34.16, *notho . . . lumine Luna*; Lucr. 5.575); *ThLL* 10.2.613.10 ff.

Latonia Luna: ie Diana. The patronymic *Latonius/-ia* is shared by Apollo and Diana as twins of Latona (Λητώ), fathered by Jupiter. The Roman goddess Luna was very soon assimilated to the Latonian Diana-Artemis, who from her earliest beginnings, like her brother, was a goddess of light (Phoebe), though in this case she went on to personify the light of the moon (Artemis Ilithyia), as one of the three facets of Diana Triformis (cf. ll. 13–14 [comm.]; Fontenrose I 437–438; II 452; Fordyce 171; E. N. O'Neil, "Cynthia and the Moon", *CPh* 53 [1958] 1). For the phraseology, cf. Catul. 34.5–6, *o Latonia, maximi / magna progenies Iovis*; 16, *tu* (scil. *Diana*) . . . *Trivia et notho es dicta lumine Luna*; Verg. *Aen.* 9.405, (*Luna*) *astrorum decus et nemorum Latonia custos*; Ov. *Met.* 15.196, *nocturna Diana*. *Latonius /-a*, as a noun or adjective, attested from Hostius (*frg.* 4 Morel, 2nd c. BC) and Catul. 34.5 (with Fordyce 172), generally denotes Apollo or his sister Diana; it is occasionally applied to the native isle of the siblings (Verg. *Ge.* 3.6, *Latonia Delos* [with Mynors 179] or more specifically to the actual mountain where they were born (Stat. *Theb.* 1.701, *Latonius Cynthus*). For *Latonia* as poetic sobriquet of the Moon, cf. A. Le Boeuffle, *Les noms latins d'astres et de constellations*, Paris, 1977, p. 262; *Astronomie, Astrologie. Lexique Latin*, Paris: Picard 1987, p. 165 s.v. *Latonia* (n° 706).

30 et color in niveo corpore purpureus: one ideal of beauty in Antiquity was the contrast between an intense flush and a pale complexion; a rosy complexion, a blend of white and red, is frequently mentioned in Hellenistic poetry (*loci* in Enk 58 *ad* Prop. 2.3.11–12). However, whereas in the latter, references are almost always to ephebi and in general to the colour of their faces, the subject here is not only a masculine deity (though treated as a *puer delicatus*), but also his body in general. The oldest Roman model is undoubtedly Enn. *Ann.* 352, *et simul erubuit ceu lacte et purpura mixta*. From classical poetry, the red-white colour contrast is preferably applied to the description of youthful female beauty, generally alluding to the cheeks and arms; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 12.65–70 *infra cit.* (where Virgil transfers to the face of the modest Lavinia [ll. 67–68] the concrete image of ivory and purple with which Homer underlined the contrast of the red blood on the

white thighs of Menelaus [Hom. *Il.* 4.141–149], this contrast between red blood and white limbs being extremely frequent; eg Ov. *Met.* 2.606 *candida puniceo perfudit membra cruore*); Prop. 2.3.10 ff.; Ov. *Am.* 1.8.35, *erubuit! decet alba quidem pudor est*; 2.5.35 ff.; 3.3.5–6; *Her.* 4.71–72; 20.122; 21.217–220; *Met.* 1.484; 491; 4.332; Stat. *Theb.* 2.231 (with Mulder 172, who cites some thirty *loci*); *Ach.* 1.161–162; in reference to the whole body in Ov. *Met.* 10.594–596, (*Atalanta*) *in . . . puellari corpus candore ruborem / traxerat, haud aliter, quam cum super atria velum / candida purpureum simulatas inficit umbras* (with Bömer 199). However, the closest passage to Lygdamus, both in content (masculine beauty), and linguistic echoes, is undoubtedly Ovid's description of the youthful beauty of Narcissus (*Met.* 3.423, *in niveo mixtum candore ruborem* [with Bömer 555], and 482–485); it is significant that when this ideal of beauty is applied to boys, they are always *pueri delicati* (cf. Stat. *Silv.* 2.1.41, *purpureo suffuso sanguine candor* [with van Dam 94–95]; 3.4.56 [with Laguna 325]).

A rosy complexion was considered a sign of youth and vitality; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 11.819, *labitur exsanguis . . .* **purpureus** *quondam* **color** *ora reliquit*; Sen. *Phaed.* 376, *non idem vigor, non ora tinguens nitida purpureus rubor*; Apul. *Met.* 5.22, *genas . . . purpureas*; Col. *Rust.* 10.289, *Phoebe purpureo radiat vultu.* So much so, that cheeks were even reddened by artificial means. Roman women used cinnabar (Plin. *Nat.* 33.118) or minium (Plin. *Nat.* 33.119), even when aware of their poisonous properties (Plin. *Nat.* 33.124); vegetable dyes were less frequently used, the most common being *fucus*, a lichen (cf. Pl. *Most.* 275; Prop. 2.18.31; Plin. *Nat.* 31.19); Greek women also used red ochre, seaweed and the juice of mulberries; cf. T. J. Leary, "That's what little girls are made of: the physical charms of elegiac women", *LCM* 15.10 (Dec. 1990) 153; Forbes, *Technology* III, p. 39; see the comm. on l. 32 *inficitur.*

in niveo corpore: for the phrase, cf. Catul. 64.364, *niveos . . . virginis artus*; Prop. 2.13.53, *niveum . . . Adonem*; [Verg.] *Catal.* 9.1, *niveus Phoebus*; Ov. *Am.* 3.3.6; *Her.* 20.122, *niveo lenis in ore rubor.* For the proverbial whiteness of snow, see Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 244 *nix* 1 [1231].

purpureus/: one of the few occurrences in Lygdamus of an adjective closing the pentameter (cf. 5.18 *pari*), an equally infrequent position in the rest of the elegiac poets; cf. Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, pp. 42–45; Lygd. 1.6 *tamen* (comm.). The adjective *purpureus* is rarely used in poetry, *roseus* or *ruber* being more usual (cf. André, *Termes de couleur*, p. 325); nevertheless, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 11.819 (*sup. cit.*);

Sen. *Phaed.* 376 (*sup. cit.*); Stat. *Silv.* 2.1.41 (*sup. cit.*); *Theb.* 1.161–162 (*infra cit.*).

31–34: the blush on the snow-white face of the newly-wed bride, modestly awaiting on the marriage bed the arrival of her husband on her wedding night, is mentioned by Sapph. 112 L-P, and in Roman literature by Catul. 61.191–195 (with Fordyce 252):

> *Iam licet venias, marite;*
> *uxor in thalamo tibi est,*
> *ore floridulo nitens,*
> *alba parthenice velut*
> *luteumve papaver.*

Overcome by emotion, the newly-wed in turn blushes like the *papaver* (the red poppy), and goes pale like the *parthenice* or "virgin flower" (the white camomile), deliberately mentioned by Catullus (the only time in Roman literature) for the symbolism of its name. Fedeli 122–123 *ad loc.* admits that the motif "had become conventional for wedding songs" (p. 123) and quotes the *Epithalamium Laurenti* (*PLM* III 42.33–35 Baehrens); cf. also Fordyce 241 *ad* Catul. 61.21. For the topos of the red-white colour contrast applied to the bride, Laguna (326 *ad* Stat. *Silv.* 3.4.56) refers to Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.244; *Theb.* 2.231; *Ach.* 1.161–162, *niveo natat ignis* (= *rubor*) *in ore / purpureus.*

However, the passage of Lygdamus is more in line with the Virgilian simile of the contrast between roses and lilies in a description of the virginal blushing of Lavinia in the presence of Turnus (*Aen.* 12.65–69):

> *(Lavinia) .... cui plurimus ignem*
> *subiecit rubor et calefacta per ora cucurrit.*
> *Indum sanguineo veluti violaverit ostro*
> *si quis ebur, aut mixta* ***rubent*** *ubi* ***lilia*** *multa*
> *alba rosa: talis* ***virgo*** *dabat ore colores.*

A similar colour contrast on the face of Lavinia appears in Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.244–245, *non talis niveos strinxit Lavinia vultus / cum Turno spectante rubet.*

But the closest model is undoubtedly a passage of the *Amores* of Ovid, who takes up the Virgilian simile of the roses and lilies, but returns it to the Catullan context of the epithalamium (*Am.* 2.5.34–42, Ovid having accused his beloved of infidelity):

> *conscia purpureus venit in ora pudor,*
> *quale coloratum Tithoni coniuge caelum*
> *subrubet, aut* ***sponso visa puella novo,***
> *quale rosae fulgent inter sua* ***lilia*** *mixtae,*

aut, ubi cantatis, Luna, laborat equis,
aut quod, ne longis flavescere possit ab annis,
Maeonis Assyrium femina tinxit ebur:
his erat aut alicui color ille simillimus horum,
et nunquam casu pulchrior illa fuit.

Lygdamus here introduces an innovation in the form of the equally red *amaranti* (cf. Plin. *Nat.* 21.47) in place of the now-hackneyed roses, and in the novel procedure of presenting the differently-coloured flowers through the image of girls intertwining them into garlands. Amaranths are only again mentioned in Roman literature by [Verg.] *Cul.* 406; Col. *Rust.* 10.175 and Ov. *Fasti* 4.439, in this last passage, curiously, again just before mentioning the *lilia . . . alba* (l. 442) among the flowers picked by the companions of Persephone (439, *has, hyacinthe, tenes, illas, amarante, moraris*; 442, *ipsa crocos tenues liliaque alba legit*). The undefined *puellae* (l. 34) may signal a faulty adaptation of this passage of Ovid (with Axelson, "Lygd. & Ov., p. 101; Tränkle 118).

Finally, Lygdamus, while supressing some of the five comparisons used by Ovid (Dawn, the eclipse of the moon—this perhaps because of the previous simile of the full moon in l. 29—and the ivory tinged in purple—previously in Virgil), adds a new simile, the reddening of apples as they ripen, though this is also taken from Ovid, in fact from one of the passages acting as models for the present description of the youthful beauty of Apollo, the myth of Narcissus; cf. Ov. *Met.* 3.482–485:

Pectora traxerunt ***roseum*** *percussa* ***ruborem,***
non aliter quam poma solent, quae candida parte,
parte rubent, *aut ut variis solet uva racemis*
ducere ***purpureum nondum matura colorem.***

Here, once again, Lygdamus has simplified, by bringing the two fruit similes together into one, while reflecting the spirit of both: the mixture of red and white characteristic of fruit that is still to ripen completely (*autumno = nondum matura*). For this fruit simile, cf. also Theoc. 7.117, Ὦ μάλοισιν Ἔρωτες ἐρευζομένοισιν ὁμοῖοι; Ov. *Her.* 21(*Cydippe Acontio*).217–218, *concidimus macie; color est sine sanguine, qualem / in* ***pomo*** *refero mente fuisse tuo*; *Met.* 4.329–331, *pueri rubor ora notavit /. . ./ Hic color aprica pendentibus arbore* ***pomis***; Longus Pastor. I. p. 22. ed. Schaef., ὁ δὲ (εἴκασεν) μήλῳ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς, ὅτι λευκὸν καὶ ἐνερευθὲς ἦν.

Finally, it should be mentioned that Lygdamus might also have had in mind Ovid's description of the bashfulness which makes

Hermaphroditus' face go red on hearing the naiad Salmacis declaring her love for him (*Met.* 4.329–333):

> *Naïs ab his tacuit. Pueri rubor ora notavit*
> *(nescis enim, quid amor), sed erubuisse decebat.*
> *Hic color aprica pendentibus arbore pomis*
> *aut ebori tincto est aut sub candore rubenti,*
> *cum frustra resonant aera auxiliaria, lunae.*

The echo of Ovid's *nescis enim quid amor* (l. 330) in l. 73, *nescis quid sit amor* (see the commentary *ad loc.*), helps nurture this suspicion.

The simile of the lilies and the roses also found its way into Prop. 2.3.10–12, ***lilia*** *non domina sint magis alba mea: / ut Maeotica nix minio si certet Hibero, / utque* ***rosae*** *puro lacte natant folia.* Note, however, that Propertius avoids the colour contrast between the two flowers.

31–32: it is a topos that shyness and modesty are attractive (*puella pudica*); cf. eg Ov. *Am.* 1.8.35, *erubuit! decet alba quidem pudor ora* (with McKeown 218); 2.4.11–12; 2.5.41–42; *Met.* 4.329–330 *sup. cit.*; Sen. *Ep.* 11.4; Kost *ad* Musaeus 160–161. For *purpureus pudor*, cf. Pfeiffer 88 *ad* Call. *Frg.* 80.10, αἰδοῖ . . . φοίνικι; McKeown 70 and 87 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.3.14 (*purpureus . . . pudor*) and 1.4.22 (*purpureas . . . genas*); Claud. *Pros.* 1.272, *niveos infecit purpura* (= *pudor*) *genas.*

31: an imitation of Ov. *Fasti* 4.153, *cum primum cupido Venus est deducta marito.* For the phrase *primum . . . deducta*, cf. also Caes. *Gall.* 5. 14.5, *quo primum virgo quaeque deducta est.*

ut: in the comparative sense, "the same as", "just like".

iuveni . . . virgo . . . marito: the adjective *iuveni* and the noun *virgo* highlight the youth and inexperience of the newly-weds. For *iuvenis*, cf. Lygd. 5.6 (comm.); for *virgo*, cf. Lygd. 4.89 *virgineam* (comm.), in addition to the following note. In fact, *virgo* is here used for *nova nupta*, the ordinary term to denote the "bride" (cf. Pl. *Cas.* 881; Ter. *Ad.* 751; Catul. 61.91 [with Fordyce 246]; 66.15; Ov. *Met.* 7.394; 12.223; *Fasti* 3.689; Mart. 3.93.26; *nova coniunx* in Ov. *Met.* 5.512; 9.103), and *iuvenis maritus* for the technical term *novus maritus* (cf. Ter. *Ad.* 938; Catul. 61.54–55; Liv. 36.17.8; *novo viro* in Catul. 66.20; *sponso . . . novo* in Ov. *Am.* 2.5.36). A similar use of *virgo* in the meaning of "bride" is already attested in Ov. *Met.* 12.216 (in fact, *nova nupta* appears in l. 223).

virgo: Axelson (*Unpoetische Wörter*, p. 58) points out the general tendency of the epic poets to avoid *puella* in favour of the more elevated *virgo*: in Virgil's *Aeneid*, *puella* only appears twice (*Aen.* 2.238; 6.307), both times in the plural as a substitute *metri gratia* for the

impracticable *virgines*; *virgo*, on the other hand, occurs 47 times. In the elegiac poets, however, the tendency is exactly the reverse: Tib. I–II 1/32; Lygd. 1/7. Lyne (135 *ad* [Verg.] *Cir.* 71 offers the following statistics for *virgo / puella*: Catul. 64 3/2; [Verg.] *Cir.* 17/11; Ov. *Met.* 76/13: the 'epyllia', as an intermediate genre, admit both words. P. Watson ("*Puella* and *Virgo*", *Glotta* 61 [1983] 119–143) expresses the opinion that "the pair are used as exact synonyms far less frequently than might be supposed" (p. 119), and stresses the semantic nuances which differentiate one term from the other: "*Virgo*, a young unmarried female, is basically a term which defines the girl's social position; there is an increasing emphasis over the centuries on physical virginity. *Puella*, a more general term, has the emotional associations of a diminutive and so can be applied to both female children and older girls viewed as erotic objects. In later times, *puella* may sometimes replace *virgo* in the sense of "virgin". Although in the meaning "young girl" the usage of the word-pair may overlap, the number of instances in which either word would have been equally appropriate is not great; these are confined largely to the less elevated genres of poetry and prose" (p. 143); cf. also P. Watson, *Axelson revisited*, pp. 433–434 (*puella/virgo*). The use made here by Lygdamus of the term *virgo* to refer to the "bride" fits in perfectly with the definition of "young woman of marriageable age".

deducta marito: the same hexameter-ending in Ov. *Fasti* 4.153 *sup. cit.* *Deducere* is the verb describing the action of the wedding procession in accompanying the newly-married bride to her husband's house (*deductio in domum*); cf. Pl. *Cas.* 472; 881, *ubi intro hanc novam nuptam deduxi*; Catul. 68.143 (*deducta* in the same place in the pentameter); Caes. *Gall.* 5.14.5; Prop. 4.3.13, *quae mihi deductae fax omen praetulit*; Liv. 10.23; Ov. *Met.* 10.462, *deducitur . . . ut nova nupta*; 4.153; Sen. *Phoen.* 271; Stat. *Theb.* 8.253; Pompon.-Sex. *Dig.* 23.2.5, *deductione . . . opus esse in mariti . . . domum, quasi in domicilium matrimonii*; *ThLL* 5.1.272.80–273.16.

32 inficitur: ie *tingit sibi*. The verb *inficere* in the sense of *tingere* is normally used in the active voice, even when referring to the face, whether tinged naturally, that is, a modest blush (cf. Hor. *Epod.* 7.15, *albus ora pallor inficit*; Luc. *Civ.* 5.214–215, *rubor igneus inficit ora / liventisque genas* [= Drac. *Romul.* 2.112; Claud. *Pros.* 1.272, *niveos infecit purpura* [ie *pudor*] *vultus*; *Carm. min.* 25.41, *pudorque genas*; *ThLL* 7.1.1413.7–10), or purposely coloured by artificial dyes (cf. Caes. *Gall.* 5.14.3, *se Britanni vitro inficiunt*; Ov. *Ars* 3.163, *femina canitiem Germanis inficit herbis*; Plin.

Nat. 11.154, *palpebrae . . . mulieribus fuco . . . infectae cotidiano*). This is the only example of this verb in the middle voice in the sense of "to tinge". Lygdamus' intention here is to indicate a deliberate process on the part of the new bride of bashfully "making up" the cheeks, as befitted the wedding night, if we are to take into account the epithalamium of Catullus (*Carm.* 61.191–195 *sup. cit.*). On the 'advantageousness' of this *falsus pudor*, suffice it to cite the the words of the old *lena* Dipsas to her pupil Corinna: *Erubuit! decet alba quidem pudor ora, sed iste, / si simules, prodest; verus obesse solet* (Ov. *Am.* 1.8.35–36). On the different artificial dyes used by Greek and Roman women to add a 'blush' to the cheeks, see the note on Lygd. 4.30.

ore rubente: ie *cum os rubeat vel <virgo> erubescens*, "on blushing" (*erubescente*). The normal syntax of this line—*teneras genas rubor inficit*—has been completely and deliberately forced by the poet in order to introduce the weight of the verbal form in the middle voice: "the new bride makes up her tender cheeks with the dye of modesty". For women making up with artificial red, see Call. *Hymn.* 5.25–29 (the toilet of Aphrodite on the occasion of the judgement of Paris). For the expression *ore rubente*, cf. Mart. 5.2.7–8, (*liber*) *quem Germanicus* ***ore*** *non* ***rubenti*** */ coram Cecropia legat puella.* Baehrens preferred the reading *ore nitente.*

genas: for the traditional connection between modest blushing and the cheeks, cf. Plin. *Nat.* 11.157, *pudoris haec sedes* (= *genae*), *ibi maxime ostenditur rubor.*

33 contexunt: "intertwine". An unusual verb in both archaic and classical poetry (cf. Lucr. 3.695; 4.57; Catul. 64.292; Verg. *Aen.* 2.112; Tib. 1.2.69), rather more frequent in the post-classical period; cf. *ThLL* 4.691.39–693.79.

amarantis: from the Gr. ἀμάραντος (< privative ἀ + μαραίνω, "to fade"; Maltby, *LALE*, p. 27), "unfading" (cf. the etymological word-play in Col. 10.175, *immortalesque amaranti*). Originally from India, the amaranth is an annual plant 80–90 cm. high; its flowers grow in a soft, dense, crest-like spike and, depending on the variety, they are generally crimson, yellow, white or mottled; the fruit has numerous shiny black seeds. Pliny the Elder (*Nat.* 21.47) underlines as well her unfading nature: *amaranto non dubie vincimur. est autem spica purpurea verius quam flos aliquis, et ipse sine odore. mirum in eo gaudere decerpi et laetius renasci. provenit Augusto mense, durat in autumnum. Alexandrino palma, qui decerptus adservatur, mireque, postquam defecere cuncti flores, madefactus aqua*

revivescit et hibernas coronas facit. summa naturae eius in nomine est, apellato, quoniam non marcescat; cf. also André, *Botanique*, p. 26 s.v. It can reasonably be assumed that Lygdamus is referring here to the crimson variety of amaranth, in view of the red-white colour contrast in the whole passage. It is also not unreasonable to suspect that Lygdamus chose amaranths on purpose, no doubt considering that the etymological play with their name was quite appropriate for Apollo's "unfading" youth, which was proverbial among the ancient poets from Call. *Ap.* 35, "forever beautiful, forever young" (cf. Lygd. 4.27 *intonsi crines* [comm.]). This deliberate choice is perhaps reflected to some extent by the fact that *amaranti* are only occasionally mentioned in Roman poetry: [Verg.] *Cul.* 406; Ov. *Fasti* 4.439; Lygd. 4.33; Col. *Rust.* 10.175 (cf. *ThLL* 1.1813.81–1814.21); cf. Axelson, "Lygd. & Ov.", p. 100; Büchner, "Lygdamus", p. 110; Tränkle 118.

alba . . . 34 candida: *albus* denotes "dull, matt white", as opposed to its near-synonym *candidus*, "bright, shining white". On the colour oppositions *albus/candidus* and *ater/niger* (dull/bright), see Lygd. 2.10 (comm.). For the semantic evolution of the epithet *albus*, cf. N. L. Baran, "Les caractéristiques essentielles du vocabulaire chromatique latin", *ANRW* II 29.1 (1983) 367–369.

34 lilia: on the proverbial whiteness of lilies, cf. Prop. 2.3.10, *lilia non domina sint magis alba mea*; Mart. 1.115.2, ***candidior** puella cycno, / argento, nive, **lilio**, ligustro*; 5.37.6, *nivesque primas, liliumque non tactum*; Claud. *Carm. min.* 31.126 Jeep, *superatque nives ac lilia candor*; cf. Calp. *Ecl.* 3.51, *sine te, vae misero, mihi lilia nigra videntur*; cf. also Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 193 s.v. *lilium* (951).

autumno candida mala rubent: for the image of autumn giving a reddish tinge to the ripe fruit, cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.5.9–12, *tolle cupidinem / immitis uvae: iam tibi lividos / distinguet autumnus racemos purpureo varius colore* (though here in an erotic context; cf. Nisbet-Hubbard 85–86).

autumno: the season in which fruits ripen and products are harvested; cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.5.10–12 *sup. cit.*; Verg. *Ge.* 2.521–522, *et varios ponit fetus autumnus, et alte / mitis in apricis coquitur vindemia saxis*; Ov. *Ars* 2.315–316, *sub autumnum, cum formosissimus annus / plenaque purpureo subruet uva mero*; *Rem.* 187, *poma dat autumnus*; *Fasti* 4.897, *venerat Autumnus calcatis sordidus uvis*. Autumn is, in fact, the proverbial season for fruit and harvesting, cf. Ov. *Met.* 9.91–92, *incessit totumque tulit praedivite cornu / autumnum et mensas, felicia poma, secundas*; Sen. *Thy.* 168, *totus in arduum autumnus rapitur*; Mart. 12.57.22, *nec in Falerno colle maior autumnus.*

candida: cf. comm. on l. 33 *alba.*

mala: the term *mālum* (Gr. μᾶλον) denotes first and foremost the apple (*ThLL* 8.208.47 ff.), and by extension fruit in general (*ThLL* 8.208.72 ff.), especially those similar to the apple (in which case the term is usually defined by an adjective; eg *malum aureum*, "the orange"); cf. André, *Botanique*, pp. 196–197. It is a less elevated term than the more poetic *poma*, which is metrically equivalent and is also used by Lygdamus in 5.20 (*et modo nata mala vellere poma manu*), no doubt to avoid the coincidence with *mălа*.

35–38: description of Apollo Citharoedus, bearing his distinctive attributes, the *palla* and the *lyra*.

35–36: the long *palla* reaching down to the ground, the Greek peplum, is the characteristic garment of Apollo Citharoedus; cf. Tib. 2.5.7–8 (ritual invocation to Phoebus), *nitidus et pulchre veni: nunc* ***indue vestem / sepositam***, *longas nunc bene pecte comas* (con Murgatroyd 173). In the whole of Roman literature it is only in two passages of Ovid that the *palla* is expressly mentioned by its name in connection with Apollo: Ov. *Am.* 1.8.59, *ipse deus vatum palla spectabilis aurea*, and *Met.* 11.166, *verrit humum Tyrio saturata murice palla* (both passages also go on to mention the lyre). However, in the plastic arts there are numerous representations of the god Apollo with peplum and lyre. In fact, Propertius mentions the existence of two statues of the lyre-playing god in the portico of Apollo on the Palatine (cf. 2.31.5–6 [with Camps 204] and 16, *Pythius* ***in longa*** *carmina* ***veste*** *sonat*). The *palla* of Apollo is habitually described as a *palla aurea* or *inaurata* ("embroidered in gold") from Call. *Ap.* 32, χρύσεα τὠπόλλωνι τό τ' ἐνδυτὸν ἥ τ' ἐπιπορπίς; cf. also Rhet. Her. 4.60, *uti citharoedus cum prodierit optime vestitus, palla inaurata inductus, cum clamyde purpurea*; [Verg.] *Cir.* 151; Ov. *Am.* 1.8.59 *sup. cit.*; Curt. 3.3.18; Stat. *Theb.* 7.38–39; *Ach.* 1.262; (for gold as an attribute of deities, see the commentary on ll. 37–38); at times, however, it is described as "purple"; cf. Ov. *Met.* 11.166 *sup. cit.*

35: the notion of the hem of the *palla* "playing" with the heels is an original image of Lygdamus. The only possible comparison is [Verg.] *Cir.* 144, *suspensam gaudens in corpore ludere vestem* (with Lyne 160); for this special use of *ludere*, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 11.497, *luduntque iubae per colla, per armos*; Sil. 16.363, *ludentis per colla iubae*; for the image of the *palla* touching the feet, Prop. 3.17.32, *feries* (scil. *Bacche*) *nudos veste fluente pedes*; Val.-Flac. 1.385 (of the seer Mopsus, son of Apollo), *palla imos ferit alba pedes*; cf. also Tib. 1.7.46, *fusa sed teneros lutea palla pedes*. In addition, the allusion to heels or ankles in connection with the length of a garment is habitual when a poet wishes to emphasize the chaste

restraint of female clothing; cf. eg Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.99 (of the *matronae*), *ad talos stola demissa et circumdata palla.*

ima . . . palla: "the bottom, or lower hem of the cloak". The term *ima* only partly affects the content of *palla.* Certain adjectives expressing a relationship of time or place (*medius, imus, summus, postremus, extremus, infimus, ultimus,* etc.) can, in referring to the noun, affect it completely or only partially. In the latter case, it is necessary when translating to use the device of converting the adjective into a noun and making the noun dependent on it. Cf. Kühner-Stegmann II.1.233; Hofmann-Szantyr 161 (§ 95 a); Ernout-Thomas 166 (§ 192 c); Bassols I.163 (§ 147.2).

videbatur: on the typical use of *videor* in the description of dream visions, see the commentary on l. 24 *est visus.*

talis: «ankles». Verg. 0; *Copa* 1; Hor. 9; Tib. 0; Prop. 4; Ov. 7; Lyg. 1. (statistics by Bömer 255 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 8.808).

alludere: the 'emendatio' *alludere* ("to play with") proposed by Cyllenius, and defended by S. Allen (*CR* 20 [1906] 455–456), would seem to be quite correct. Lygdamus transfers to the brushing of the clothes against the heels a use of the verb *alludere* that was quite common in Latin literature to describe the elusive, "playful", contact of the waves as they dashed on the sand of the beach; cf. Cic. *Nat.* 2.100, *mare sic terram appetens litoribus alludit* (*alludit* dett.: *eludit* codd., Pease 796); Catul. 64.67, *omnia quae toto delapsa e corpore passim / ipsius ante pedes fluctus salis alludebant*; Sen. *Oed.* 267, *Neptune qui fluctu brevi utrimque nostro geminus alludis solo*; Min. Fel. 3.3, *quod* (scil. *aequor*) *vicissim nunc adpulsum nostris pedibus adluderet fluctus, nunc relabens . . . in sese resorberet.* It was Ovid who extended this use of *alludere*, referring to the sea, to toes coming into contact with the water; cf. Ov. *Met.* 4.342, (*Hermaphroditus*) *in alludentibus undis summa pedum . . . tingit*; Stat. *Theb.* 9.336, *extremis alludunt aequora plantis* (scil. *Europae*); and Valerius Flaccus even applied it to the action of the wind caressing the tops of the trees (cf. Val.-Flac. 6.665, *summa cacumina silvae lenibus alludit flabris levis auster*) and Seneca to the fruit-laden branches repeatedly brushing against the open mouth of the starving Tantalus, only to escape his bite each time (cf. Sen. *Thy.* 156–157, *tremens / alludit patulis arbor hiatibus*); even the geographer Julius Solinus applied it to the licking of flames (cf. Sol. 5.24, *epulantes adluit flamma*). There is therefore nothing unusual about this Lygdamean usage, since the examples show (cf. *ThLL* 1.1697.71–1699.9) that the verb *alludere* is applied to any non-continuous, intermittent brushing or contact, like that of the hem of

the *palla* against the heels. The reading *illudere* should be ruled out, in spite of the unanimity of the mss. and eds., since this verb never means "to play with", but "to make fun of, to mock" and, if accepted here, would be a 'hapax legomenon' (*OLD illudo* 1a; *ThLL* 7.1.390.9–13). The corruption of *alludere* into *illudere* can easily be explained in palaeographical terms.

palla: a rectangular cloak reaching down to the heels and used in Rome as an outdoor garment by married women (*matronae*); cf. Non. p. 537, *palla est honestae mulieris vestimentum, id est tunicopallium*; Serv. *Aen.* 11.576, *palla proprie est muliebris vestis deducta usque ad vestigia.* It was expressly forbidden for *meretrices* and women convicted of adultery to wear ankle-length clothing (*longa vestis*); instead, they had to wear a short tunic or a toga, often coloured, as a sign of their disgrace (*vestis meretricia*); cf. R. Kreis-v. Schaewen, "Palla", *RE* 18.3 (1949) 153–154; Bömer 215–216 *ad* Ov. *Fasti* 4.134, *longa vestis*; *ThLL* 10.1.119.43–69. In connection with a deity or mythological hero, a reference to the full-length *palla* emphasizes their divine and generally foreign origins; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.404, *pedes vestis* (scil. *Veneris*) *defluxit ad imos*; Tib. 1.7.46 (Osiris-Bacchus), *fusa sed ad teneros lutea palla pedes* (with Smith 336); Ov. *Her.* 21(20).164 (*Hymenaeus*); *Fasti* 2.107, (*Arion*) *induerat . . . pallam* (with Bömer 89); *Met.* 6.705 (*Boreas*); Plin. Nat. 36.29, *Liberum patrem palla velatum*; Val.-Flac. 3.718 (*Iason*); Stat. *Theb.* 11.400 and 12.312 (*Polynices*); *ThLL* 10.1.120.15–29. Other notable wearers of the *palla*, apart from Apollo, were Hermes (cf. Stat. *Theb.* 7.35) and especially Bacchus (cf. Ar. *Ra.* 46; Prop. 3.17.32 *sup. cit.*; Stat. *Ach.* 1.262; Sen. *Her. f.* 475; *Oed.* 425). Among mortals, as a male garment its use was restricted to non-Romans, especially Greeks, or to dramatic actors, particularly those specializing in tragedy, and to singers, poets, lyre-players and seers, as a special garment in the image and likeness of Apollo Citharoedus, their divine patron; cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.18.15; 3.1.12; Bömer 281 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 11.166; R. Kreis-v. Schaewen, "Palla", *RE* 18.3 (1949) 154–155; *ThLL* 10.1.119.4–15. Outside the circle of gods, heroes and artists, a man's wearing the *palla* was taken as a sign of effeminacy; cf. Prop. 4.9.47; Stat. *Ach.* 2.5; *ThLL* 10.1.120.29–31. The term *palla* is predominantly poetic (cf. *ThLL* 10.1.119.36–38).

36: a mere filler, since the mention of *palla* in the previous line is sufficient to inform the reader that it is Apollo who is dressed in it. Moreover, the fact that Lygdamus can catch a glimpse of the splendour of Apollo's frame when attired in a long *palla* can only be understood if, as is pointed out by L. Lenaz (in La Penna 363), the *palla*

is transparent, since it is of course a full-length garment that covers the whole body (cf. Stat. *Theb.* 12.537, *pectora palla tota latent*). In this connection it should be noted that the most fashionable transparent garments at the time of Augustus and until the 2nd half of the 1st c. AD were made of fine silk from Cos; cf. Hor. *Od.* 4.13.13, *Coae . . . purpurae*; *Sat.* 1.2.101–102, *Cois tibi paene videre est / ut nudam*; Prop. 1.2.2, *tenuis Coa veste movere sinus* (= 4.5.56); 2.1.5; 4.2.23; 5.23; Tib. 2.3.53–54 (with Smith 425–426); 4.29–30; Ov. *Ars* 2.298; McKeown 114 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.5.13–14. For denunciation of the immorality of this piece of clothing, cf. Mart. 8.68.7–8; Sen. *Ben.* 7.9.5; *Ep.* 90.20; Sen. *Contr.* 2.7 (p. 239 Kiessl.).

namque: "for indeed, for truly". A reinforced form of the explicative conjunction *nam*, used particularly before a vowel (also before a consonant among poets from Andron. *Carm.* 22 and Enn. *Scen.* 355). It serves to offer an explanation and normally comes at the beginning of its phrase, although from the *neoterici* onwards, in imitation of the Hellenistic poets, it can occasionally occupy later positions (eg Catul. 64.384 [2nd]; 66.65 [5th]). Archaic and strictly classical authors generally make little use of this particle: Hor. 16 times (*Od.* 3; *Epod.* 2; *Sat.* 10; *Ep.* 1); Prop. 9 (1.3.37; 20.17; 2.21.12; 25.31; 3.13.17; 20.21; 4.1.57; 109; 7.3); Tib. 2 (5.3; 7.59); however, Virgil (60) uses it profusely in the *Aeneid* (some 37 times; *Ecl.* 8; *Ge.* 15). Ovid (46) never uses *namque* in his youthful erotic works (apart from 5 times in *Her.*) but follows Virgil in his epic poems (*Met.* 22; *Fasti* 8); in his elegiac compositions in exile he is not as strict as in his earlier years (*Tr.* 6; *Ponto* 5). Cf. Norden, *Aeneis VI*, Anh. III.3, p. 403; Marouzeau, *L'Ordre des Mots* III.107; Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, pp. 47 n. 4, 122 nn. 10 and 12; Kühner-Stegmann II.2.119; Hofmann-Szantyr 507 (§ 275); Ernout-Thomas 451 (§ 432) and 453 (§ 435); Bassols II.116 (§ 122) and 118 (§ 126).

in nitido corpore: *nitidus* basically means "brilliant, shining" (*OLD nitidus* 1 and 2), and in this sense it functions as a Latin equivalent to *Phoebus*, the epithet of Apollo from the Greek period onwards, particularly appropriate for this divinity after his late identification with the sun-god (cf. Lygd. 4.21 [comm.]). In its secondary meaning, and with reference to the body, it alludes to its attractiveness, "glowing with beauty, youth or sim." (*OLD nitidus* 3); cf. Tib. 2.5.7 (invocation to Phoebus), *nitidus pulcherque veni*. On the meaning of *nitidus*, cf. Ov. *Ars* 3.74, *perit, in nitido qui fuit ore, color*; Stat. *Silv.* 2.2.10, *nitidae iuvenilis gratia Pollae*; 3.1.87 (with Laguna 158); Apul. *Flor.* 3, *corpus*

totum gratissimum, membra nitida. Niteo, nitor and *nitidus* frequently appear together with *albus* and *candidus* (cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.5.18; Ov. *Medic.* 52; *Tr.* 3.10.22) and are often applied to white objects (cf. Tib. 1.4.64; Hor. *Od.* 1.19.5; Ov. *Met.* 1.610–611; 2.3; [Verg.] *Mor.* 106); Tibullus in 1.7.8 uses *nitidi* of the white horses drawing the chariot of Messalla *triumphator*.

37–38: the lyre of Apollo Citharoedus is "of gold" from Hes. *Scut.* 203 (cf. also Call. *Ap.* 32–33; Pi. *P.* 1.1–2, χρυσέα φόρμιγξ, Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ ἰοπλοκάμων / σύνδικον Μοισᾶν κτέανον; φόρμιγγος περικαλλέος in Hom. *Il.* 1.603). The first mention of this detail in Roman literature is Prop. 3.3.14, *aurata . . . lyra* (with Fedeli 128); cf. also Ov. *Am.* 1.8.60, *tractat inauratae consona fila lyrae*; *Ars* 2.494, *movit inauratae pollice fila lyrae*; *Met.* 8.15–16, *auratam . . . lyram* (with Bömer 20–21). It is a long-established convention dating from Homeric times that objects possessed by the gods should be made of gold; cf. Williams 39 *ad* Call. *Ap.* 32–35; Gray, "Metal Working in Homer", *JHS* 74 (1954) 1 ff.; E. R. Dodds, *Euripides. Bacchae* (Oxford 1960²) 145 (*ad* E. *Ba.* 553); Bömer 269 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 5.189; for examples in Latin, cf. *ThLL* 2.1521.66 ff.

As regards inlaying with tortoise-shell (*testudo*), cf. Prop. 4.6.32, *testudineae . . . lyrae*; [Tib.] 3.8.22, *testudinea Phoebe superbe lyra*; Philostr. Iun. *Im.* 1.10. This adornment based on tortoise-shell inlay appears to be modern. Previously, the shell of the tortoise is mentioned in connection with the actual construction of the lyre, not as an adornment but as the instrument's sound box; in fact, according to mythical tradition, Hermes, the first to make a lyre, did so with the shell of a tortoise (χέλυς); cf. *h. Merc.* 33; Bömer 297 *ad* Ov. *Fasti* 5.104; and its use to this end is still attested in the Roman period (cf. Paus. 8.54.7, παρέχεται δὲ τὸ Παρθένιον καὶ ἐς λύρας ποίησιν χέλωνας ἐπιτηδειοτάτας; Ambr. *Iob* 4.36, *testudo enim dum vivit luto mergitur; ubi mortua fuerit, tegmen eius aptatur in usum canendi et piae gratiam disclipinae, ut septem vocum discrimina muneris modulantibus obloquatur*). Hence, by synecdoche, *testudo*—like the Greek χέλυς; cf. *h. Merc.* 25; 153; A. *Fr.* 320; E. *Alc.* 449; *HF* 683; Liddell-Scott 1987 s.v. χέλυς 2—sometimes denotes the lyre itself; cf. Verg. *Ge.* 4.464, (*Orpheus*) *cava solans aegrum testudine amorem* (Serv. *ad loc.*, *'cava testudine' periphrasis citharae*); Hor. *Od.* 1.32.13–14, *o decus Phoebi et dapibus supremi / grata testudo Iovis* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 365); 3.11.3, *testudo resonare septem callida nervis*; 4.3.17–18, *o testudinis* ***aureae*** */ dulcem quae strepitum, Pieri, temperas*; *Poet.* 395; Prop. 2.34.79, *docta testudine*; Val.-Flac. 1.277; Sil.

11.288. Pliny the Elder (*Nat.* 9.11) attributes the invention of such tortoise-shell inlays to one Carbilius Pollio, who apparently lived just before the civil war between Marius and Sulla (according to Plin. *Nat.* 33.11) and they were used principally for decoration, as he tells us, *lectosque et repositoria*; cf. Varro *Lat.* 9.47, *lectos, alios ex ebore alios ex testudine*; Verg. *Ge.* 2.463, *nec varios inhiant pulchra testudine postis* (with Mynors 163); Ov. *Met.* 2.737–738, *ebore et testudine cultos / . . . thalamos* (with Bömer 412–413); Luc. *Civ.* 10.120–121; Vell. 2.56.2; Stat. *Silv.* 2.4.11, *domus rutila* ***testudine fulgens***; Homer. Lat. 316, *thalamos . . . testudine cultos*; Juv. 11.94–95 (with Mayor); 14.308; Apul. *Met.* 10.34; Javol. *Dig.* 32.100.4, *lectos testudineos pedibus inargentatos*; Marquardt-Mau, *Privatleben* (1886) 310. Apart from the *testudo*, other equally exotic components became part of the rich ornamentation of Apollo's lyre, since against the background of ever-increasing luxury in Imperial Rome, vulgar gold was no longer sufficient. Thus, Ovid attributes to Apollo a lyre made of plates of ivory and precious stones (cf. *Met.* 11.167, *distinctamque fidem gemmis, et dentibus Indis*). On the luxurious decoration of lyres in Antiquity, cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.11.22, *eburna . . . cum lyra* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 177 on ivory ornamentation); Rhet. Her. 4.60, *uti citharoedus . . . citharam tenens exornatissimam auro et ebore distinctam.* The luxurious decoration of Apollo's lyre is simply another detail of the luxury and opulence which continually surrounded this young god from the time when Callimachus defined his image for ever in his hymn to the deity (*Ap.* 32 ff.), an opulence about which the satirist Marsias angrily complains in Apul. *Flor.* 3 (p. 4.16 Helm), *quod esset et coma intonsus, et genis gratus, et corpore glabellus, et arte multiscius, et fortuna opulentus. Quid, quod et vestis textu tenuis, tactu mollis, purpura radians? Quid, quod et lyra eius auro fulgurat, ebore candicat, gemmis variegat?*

Although the Greeks generally attribute the invention of the lyre to the young Hermes (from *h. Merc.* 24–61), who was then to pass it on to Apollo (cf. McKeown 19 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.1.11–12), Apollo himself sometimes takes the place of Hermes as *inventor*; cf. Call. *Del.* 253 (see W. H. Mineur [Leiden 1984] *ad loc.*, and K. J. McKay, *Erysichton: A Callimachean Comedy* [Leiden 1962] 166–167); Pl. *R.* 399d–e; Diodorus Siculus (5.75.3, cf. 3.59.5–6) seems to suggest that Hermes reinvented the lyre after Apollo had destroyed a similar invention of his own; Paus. 9.30.1; [Plut.] *De mus.* 14 (1135f–1136a). Sometimes, in fact, mortals appear as inventors or co-inventors of this instrument, such as Orpheus, Amphion, Cerambus (Ant. Lib. 22.3), and especially Terpander. On this question, see T. Hägg, "Hermes and the Inven-

tion of the Lyre. An Unorthodox Version", *Symb. Osl.* 64 (1989) 36–73 (especially p. 62 n. 96).

On the construction of the tortoise-shell lyre in Antiquity, see P. Phaklares, "Χέλυς", *AD* 32 (1977) 218–233; P. Courbin, "Les lyres d'Argos", *BCH* Suppl. 6 (1980) 93–114; H. Robberts, "Reconstructing the Greek Tortoise-Shell Lyre", *World Archaeology* 12 (1981) 303–312; D. Paquette, *L'Instrument de musique dans la céramique de la Grèce antique* (Paris 1984) 145–171; A. Bélis, "A propos de la construction de la lyre", *BCH* 109 (1985) 201–220.

In addition, the formulation of this distich has forcefully attracted the attention of scholars in that it combines in the short space of two lines the prosaic, almost technical language of the formula *pendebat laeva* ... *parte* with the learned and complex style represented by the placing of the apposition (*artis opus rarae*) before the noun it relates to (*lyra*), as well as leaving a considerable distance between the two terms. Normally the phrase in apposition goes after the noun in question. The prolepsis and the studied hyperbaton—with the subordinate term opening the distich and the term it refers to closing it, that is, in the most prominent places—have the effect of adding emphasis; cf. Hofmann-Szantyr 409 (§ 215 E).

37 artis opus rarae: "an incomparable work of art", in apposition to *lyra* (cf. Liv. 5.7.3, *vineas, tam longi temporis opus, incendium hausit*, where *opus* also establishes a cause-effect relationship between the noun to which it is in apposition and its genitive, as "fruit, result of"). For *ars* in the sense of "artistic ability", cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.639, *arte laboratae vestes*; *ThLL* 2.672.51–673.9. It is also frequent for an adjective—like *rarus* here—to reinforce this meaning; cf. Cic. *Verr.* 4.103, *eburneae Victoriae* ... ***summa arte** perfectae*; Catul. 64.50, *vestis* ... ***mira** ... **arte*** (= Verg. *Aen.* 9.309); Ov. *Met.* 13.289, *caelestia dona* (scil. *Achillis arma*) , ***artis** opus **tantae*** (with Bömer 273); Liv. 34.52.5, (*vasa*) *caelata pleraque, quaedam **eximiae artis*** (= Suet. *Tib.* 74); Val.-Max. 4.3.7, *vasa argentea magno pondere et **exquisita arte***; Curt. 5.6.5, *dolabris **pretiosae artis** vasa caedebant*; Plin. *Nat.* 34.37, (*opera*) ***tantae** omnia **artis***; Val.-Flac. 5.6, *caelataque **multa arte** ... velamina*; Suet. *Cal.* 22, *simulacra numinum* ... ***arte praeclara***. However, the phrase *rara ars* is only found in Lygdamus. For *rarus* in the sense of "incomparable, of uncommon quality or beauty", cf. Catul. 69.3, *non si illam rarae labefactes munere vestis*; Prop. 1.8.42, *Cynthia rara mea est!*; *OLD rarus* 6. For the combination, cf. Ov. *Fasti* 3.820, *rarum pectine denset opus* (scil. *Pallas*), where *opus* in itself has the pregnant meaning of *artis opus*

(cf. *ThLL* 2.673.9–26); and particularly Ov. *Met.* 13.289 (*sup. cit.*). For the expression *artis opus*, cf. Cic. *Nat.* 2.57, *in operibus nostrarum artium*; Liv. 25.40.2, *inde primum initium mirandi Graecarum artium opera*; in a different sense Ov. *Ars* 1.266, *artis* (sc. *amatoriae*) *opus*; 2.14, *hoc erit artis opus*; *Fasti* 1.268, *movi callidus artis opus* (ie *dolum*); 6.662, *frangeret artis opus*; *CLE* 332 (Pompeii). Apart from Ovid, this phrase is not found in other Augustan or post-Augustan poets.

38 pendebat laeva . . . parte: a prosaic expression, characteristic of technical language, as if he were describing a statue. Moreover, *pars* is not a habitual term to refer to a person's side (the proper term being *latus*), or to indicate position with reference to a particular viewpoint (the normal phrase would be *laeva manu*); cf. as the closest parallel Curt. 6.5.27, *vestis non tota . . . corpori obducitur: nam laeva pars . . . est nuda*).

pendebat: "hung", with the pregnant sense of "to be in disuse, silent, inactive", as in Hor. *Od.* 3.19.20, *cur pendet tacita fistula cum lyra?*, this being, as it were, the "resting position" of musical instruments like the lute and lyre which, when not being used, "hang from the belt"; for this use of *pendere* denoting inactivity, cf. also Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.15, *in scalis latuit metuens pendentis habenae*; Tib. 2.5.29–30, *pendebat . . . in arbore . . . / garrula . . . fistula*; Ov. *Met.* 11.475, *obvertit lateri pendentes navita remos*.

laeva . . . parte: a rather prosaic expression which can be taken as an ablative of separation or a locative, in view of the absence of the prepositions *de*, *ex*, *in*.

garrula . . . lyra: the description of musical instruments as "talkative" first appears in Hor. *Od.* 3.11.5, (*testudo*) *nec loquax olim neque grata*, then in Tib. 2.5.30, *garrula . . . fistula* (with Murgatroyd 187), and subsequently only in poetry; cf. Manil. 5.330–331, *garrula . . . in modulos . . . tibia*; Mart. 14.54.2, *garrula sistra*; 14.169.1, *garrulus . . . anulus* (= rattle consisting of rings); cf. also Serv. *Aen.* 7.14, *'arguto pectine' arguto, stridulo*; *ThLL* 6.2 1699.31–36. The "loquacity" of the strings of the lyre had already been mentioned in Lucr. 4.981–982, *citharae liquidum carmen chordasque* ***loquentis*** *auribus accipere* (cf. also Buc. Eins. 1.23, *temptare loquentia fila*; Apul. *Met.* 5.15, *iubet citharam loqui: psallitur; tibias agere: sonatur*). In fact, *garrulus* is simply an innovative poetic personification of the now-hackneyed terms, as applied to musical instruments, *sonans*, "issuing sounds" (cf. Prop. 2.30.16, *locus . . . in quo, tibia docta, sones*; Stat. *Ach.* 1.575, *sonanti . . . citharae*, 2.157, *Apollineo . . . fila sonantia plectro*) or the more musical *canorus*, "issuing melodious sounds"

(cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.120, *cithara fidibusque canoris*; 9.503, *aere canoro*; Hor. *Od.* 1.12.11, *fidibus canoris*; Ov. *Fasti* 3.849, *tubas . . . canoras*). Cf. also the commentary on l. 69 *cithara . . . sonora*. In the same innovative line as *garrulus* is *argutus*; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 7.24, *arguta . . . fistula*; [Verg.] *Cir.* 178; Calp. 7.12; Sil. 7.439; 13.347; 17.18; *ThLL* 2.557.18–23.

39–42: the moment he appears, Apollo Citharoedus as usual intones a happy song accompanied by his lyre before speaking (ll. 39–40); cf. Ov. *Ars* 2.493–497, *subito manifestus Apollo / movit inauratae pollice fila lyrae; / . . . / . . . / is mihi . . . dixit*; but once the musical performance is over (l. 41), the *felices cantus* become *tristia verba*, serious words bearing sad news. The adversative conjunction *sed* underlines this contrast, the brusque transition from festive to serious, from joyful to sorrowful. However, Apollo, protector of poets, sugars his sad news (*dulci . . . modo*): a messenger of ill omen, he does, however, express himself with the tact with which one gives bad news to a loved one (Lygdamus = *cura deum*).

This pair of distichs acts as a transition formula between the preceding detailed description and the following lengthy address of Apollo. The simple original scheme—*primum felices cantus, deinde seria verba*—is artlessly complicated by Lygdamus when, carried away by his learned enthusiasm for a meticulous ἔκφρασις, he introduces a detailed description—though one of considerable interest for the history of music—of the performance of a lyre-player (first instrumental music, then the song), which is clearly subordinate to the previous description of Apollo Citharoedus. The following line (41), apart from *sed post*, is a simple filler which adds nothing to the previous distich, but which reveals a somewhat less-than-complete mastery of the technique of ἔκφρασις. All of this produces a sort of anacoluthon in which the opening *primum* is not followed by the expected *deinde*, but by a *sed*; cf. Cic. *Off.* 1.44, *primum . . . autem*; Hor. *Poet.* 75–76, *primum, / post etiam*; Ov. *Met.* 14.61 ff., *primo . . . sed*; Hofmann-Szantyr 713 d (§ 19); S. Wahlén, *Studia critica in decl. min. sub nomine Quint. feruntur*, Diss. Uppsala 1930, pp. 35 and 90 (*ad* Quint. *Decl.* 348 p. 371.17–18 Ritter).

The lyre could be played in two ways: either with the right hand and the aid of a plectrum, or with the fingers of the left hand; in fact, the two ways of playing could alternate within the same performance (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.646–647; Stat. *Silv.* 5.5.31 ff.), in which case the fingers of the left hand played to accompany the singing, while the plectrum was used for the purely instrumental part (Apul. *Flor.* 15 p. 20 Helm).

39 veniens: ie *dum veniebat* ("when he arrived"). Here the term has sacred connotations: *venire* is the *vox propria* to describe the epiphany of a god; cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.11.5; 24; 2.1.34; 2.2.20; 3.7.80 (for a similar use in the context of an erotic appearance on the part of the *puella divina*, see McKeown 110 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.5.9, *ecce, Corinna venit*). The present participle *veniens* here can be taken in two ways:

a) As expressing an action previous to the principal verb (= 'cum venisset'). This use of the present participle is first found in elegy, although only in Prop. 2.18.9, *illum saepe suis decedens* (= 'cum de caelo decessisset') *fovit in ulnis* (with Enk 255) and Ov. *Met.* 3.526, (*Tiresias*) *talia dicentem* (= 'locutum') *proturbat Echione natus*. This sense is attested more often in post-classical Latin, particularly in Livy (eg 24.7.11, *Romam veniens* [= 'postquam venit', ἐλθών] *comitia edixit*) and Tacitus (eg *Ann.* 12.48.1, *monente* (= κελεύσαντος) *praefecto inditur lecticae*) and becomes generalized at the end of the Latin period. Cf. Ed. Wölfflin, *ALL* 13 (1904) 273; Hofmann-Szantyr 386–387 (§ 207 a), with comments in the review by F. Bömer, *Gymnasium* 73 (1966) 334.

b) The idea of simultaneousness which characterizes it can be maintained. The fact is that *veniens* here is felt to be a simple for a compound, *adveniens*, a participle which, being more specific in application, falsely evokes an idea of previousness with respect to *dedit*; cf. Kühner-Stegmann II.1.756; Ernout-Thomas 274 (§ 286); Bassols I.368–369.

hanc . . . modulatus: ie *lyram . . . modulatus*. For *modulor* in the sense of "to play a musical instrument" among the Augustan poets the only known instance is Hor. *Od.* 1.32.4–5, *barbite . . . / Lesbio primum modulate civi* (here, moreover, in a passive sense); apart from Lygdamus, there are very few later examples; cf. *Laus Pis.* 175, *quamvis . . . gravis obstreperet modulatis bucina nervis*; Claud. 34.15, *modulatus pectine nervos*. This verb is normally used with the meaning of "to sing verses to the sound of a musical instrument" (cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 10.51, *carmina pastoris Siculi modulabor avena*; Tib. 2.1.53–54, *est modulatus avena / carmen*; Ov. *Rem.* 181, *pastor inaequali modulatur harundine carmen*; *i.a.*). Perhaps it should be corrected to *moderatus*.

plectro . . . eburneo: the quill-shaped implement finished in the shape of a heart and generally made of ivory (cf. Prop. 3.3.25, *dixerat* [scil. *Apollo*] *et* ***plectro*** *sedem mihi monstrat* ***eburno***), used to pluck the strings of the lyre (cf. Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.2, *Apollineo . . . fila sonantia plectro cum quaterem*). Although Lygdamus—like Propertius—speaks of an ivory plectrum, the best and oldest tradition holds that Apollo's plectrum was made of gold (cf. *h. Ap.* 185; Pi. *N.* 5.24; E. *HF* 351), like his

lyre and other attributes (cf. comm. on ll. 37–38); a gold plectrum was thus dedicated to him in Delphi by the Megarians (cf. Plu. *Pyth. Orac.* 402 a). It should be pointed out that *plectrum* is the *vox propria* to denote the plectrum for the lyre, as a result of which Virgil never uses this term, which is too technical and prosaic; in its place he introduces into Latin poetry the term *pecten* (strictly "comb for weaving"; cf. Verg. *Ge.* 1.294), thus establishing an extremely beautiful comparison between the action of plucking the strings of the lyre and that of weaving; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.647, *eadem . . . pectine pulsat eburno*; Juv. 6.382, *crispo numerantur pectine chordae*; *OLD pecten* 2b.

Note also (with Bömer 385 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.601) that the *plectrum* as a symbol of the musical art of Apollo (cf. *h. Ap.* 184–185; Ov. *Met.* 11.168; Fontenrose 432; Kiessling-Heinze *ad* Hor. *Od.* 4.2.33; Arn. 6.12) is, while scrupulously exact, also an anachronism. Homer did not know of its use; the invention is attributed to Sappho; cf. Hsch. *Sud.* s.v. *Sappho*; Schneider, *RE* 21.1 (1951) 187.50 ff.

40 felices cantus: the adjective *felix* applied to a work of art or literature underlines the idea of "felicitous, elegant, well finished"; cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.17.27, *sunt mihi pro magno felicia carmina censu*; Mart. 6.64.7; 9.44.2; Quint. *Inst.* 9.4.27, *felicissimus . . . sermo est, cui . . . rectus ordo . . . contigit*; 10.1.111. An infelicitous work, in contrast, can be described as *infelix* (cf. Hor. *Poet.* 34, *infelix operis summa*).

cantus . . . dedit: the periphrasis *cantum dare* is widely found in poetry from Verg. *Aen.* 1.398; 9.618, *dat tibia cantum*; cf. Luc. *Civ.* 4.186, *classica det bellos saevos neglege cantus*; Manil. 5.332, *dabit cantus*.

ore sonante: for the expression, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.183, *ora sonant*; Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.43–44, *os / magna sonaturum*; Ov. *Am.* 3.9.12, *ora . . . sonant*; *Met.* 8.533, *ora sonantia*; *Fasti* 1.572, *ore sonante* (in the same position in the line); Luc. *Civ.* 6.621; 761; Val.-Flac. 4.19 (*resonantia*); *ThLL* 9.2.1078.73–75.

41 postquam: this conjunction is used to indicate that the action of the main clause is later than that of the subordinate clause. Although it can sometimes be used with the imperfect or pluperfect subjunctive under the influence of historic *cum*, classical prose regularly uses the perfect indicative with *postquam*, restricting the use of the pluperfect indicative—the tense which the 'consecutio temporum' actually calls for—to those cases in which the main clause contains an accusative or ablative of time specifying the interval between the main and the subordinate actions (cf. Cic. *Div.* 2.46, *quod . . . signum Iovis biennio post, quam erat locatum, in Capitolio conlocabatur*): extremely rare in

comedy (only in Ter. *Andr.* 177; *Phorm.* 909), in Cicero only in the speeches and letters; never in Caesar or Horace; first in poetry in Verg. *Aen.* 11.94, although it is rare among the Augustans (cf. Prop. 4.9.63; Ov. *Met.* 8.875); frequent, on the other hand, in Sallust (eg *Iug.* 28.2) and especially in Livy (26 times). Post-classical Latin generalized the use of the pluperfect indicative in the *postquam*-clause. Cf. Kühner-Stegmann II.2.353; Hofmann-Szantyr 598 (§ 322 a); Ernout-Thomas 361–362 (§ 358), 366–367 (§ 362); Bassols II.333–335 (§ 325).

fuerant . . . locuti: personification of the fingers as "talking". For the "loquacity" of the hands and fingers, cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.137, *per quos digitos arcana loquaris*; *Tr.* 2.453, *digitis . . . est nutuque loquitur*; *AL* 111.9–10, *tot linguae, quot membra viro: mirabilis ars est, / quae facit articulos* (ie *digitos*) *ore silente loqui*; Petr. *Frg.* 19, *manu puer loquaci*; Manil. 5.326, *et quodcumque manu loquitur, flatuque movetur*; Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.85, *hae manus, prope est, ut dicam, ipsae loquuntur*; Sidon. *Carm.* 23.269, (scil. *pantomimi agunt*) *clausis faucibus et loquente gestu, / nutu, crure, manu, rotatu*; Maxim. 5.17, *docta loqui digitis, et carmina fingere docta et . . . sollicitare lyram*; Cassiod. *Var.* 5.51.8 ('de digitis pantomimi'), *orchestarum loquacissimae manus, linguosi digiti, silentium clamosum, expositio tacita*; for this use of *loqui* applied to other parts of the body, cf. *ThLL* 7.2.1667.81 ff. On the poetic use of *loqui* to refer to the sound of musical instruments, apart from the commentary on l. 38 *garrula . . . lyra*, cf. *ThLL* 7.2.1667.81 ff.

cum voce: the formula is found in the same musical context—singing to the accompaniment of the lyre—and in the same position in the hexameter in Ov. *Met.* 5.112, *citharam cum voce moveres/*.

42 edidit: "uttered"; as opposed to the neutral *dicere*, the verb *edere* always implies a strong element of solemnity; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 5.693 (Aeneas praying to Jupiter); Phaedr. 1.12.12 (last words of a dying man); accordingly, it is often used in the ambit of prophecy to denote the act of "pronouncing <an oracle>"; cf. Enn. *Scen.* 43, *ex oraclo . . . edidit Apollo, puerum . . . temperaret tollere*; Cic. *Tusc.* 1.116, *oraculo edito*; *Div.* 2.115, *cum illa sors edita est . . . regi*; Liv. 22.10.10, *ex fatalibus libris editum erat ut is voveret*; 30.2.13, *editi a collegio pontificum dei quibus sacrificaretur*; Ov. *Fasti* 3.856, *quam sterili terrae Delphicus edat opem*; *OLD edo* 6b and 8c. This solemn tone explains the recurring use of the periphrasis *edere ore* in epic, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 7.194; Ov. *Met.* 1.637; 8.703; 12.577 (with Bömer 182); Sil. 6.457; *ThLL* 9.2.1079.74 ff.; for a grandiloquent and pompous use in elegy, not without its subtle humour, cf. Tib. 1.4.73, *haec mihi, quae canerem Titio, deus* (= *Priapus*)

edidit ore (with Murgatroyd 155–156). The phrase *verba edere*, given its technical and prosaic use in the sense of *promulgare, proferre* (cf. Cic. *Quinct.* 63, *in ea verba quae Naevius edebat*; Paul. *Dig.* 2.13.2, *iubet praetor verba testamenti edere*; *ThLL* 5.2.92.13–14), is seldom found in poetry: apart from the present passage of Lygdamus, only in Tib. 1.9.26; Ov. *Met.* 5.106 (*ThLL* 5.2.87.20–21).

dulci tristia verba modo: the mss. have the reading *tristi dulcia*, a hypallage accepted by very few recent editors (Cartault, Havet, Calonghi, Lenz-Galinsky, Lee). Since Broukhusius the reading *dulci tristia*, which already appeared in some of the *recentiores*, has been preferred, given that the content of the address is sad, even though Apollo softens the blow. For the combination *dulci tristia*, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 12.802, *dulci tristes*. Some mss. have *sono* instead of *modo* to close the line.

43–80: direct words of the god.

43–50: greeting of Phoebus, who introduces himself as a prophetic divinity who speaks the truth.

43–44: greeting. Strong linguistic and literary echoes of book III of the *Ars Amatoria* of Ovid: 1) *cura deum* corresponds to Ov. *Ars* 3.405, / *cura deum fuerunt olim regumque poetae*; cf. also *Am.* 3.9.17, *at sacri vates et divum cura vocamur*. However, the idea of the protection given to poets by the gods is older than Ovid; cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.17.13–14, *di me tuentur, dis pietas mea / et Musa cordi est*; Tib. 2.5.113, *nam divum servat tutela poetas*; 2) *Pieridesque favent* corresponds to *Ars* 3.548, *numen inest illis Pieridesque favent/*; 3) Phoebus, Bacchus and the Muses, the trio of deities inspiring poetry, are also mentioned as protectors of poets in Ov. *Ars* 3.347–348, *o ita, Phoebe, velis, ita vos, pia numina vatum, / insignis cornu Bacche novemque deae!* (cf. also *Am.* 1.3.11, *at Phoebus comitesque novem vitisque repertor*).

For the Ovidian echoes in this passage, cf. G. Baligan, "Il libro terzo del *Corp. Tib.*", *St. pubbl. dall'Ist. di Filol. class. della Fac. di Lett. e Fil. dell'Univ. degli Studi di Bologna* I (Bologna: U. P. E. B., 1948) 28–29; Axelson, "Lygd. & Ov.", pp. 102–103; Büchner, "Lygdamus", pp. 506–507; Tränkle 122.

43 salve: colloquial greeting formula, very seldom found in poetry (Lucr. 0; Hor. *Od.* 1.32.15; Prop. 4.9.71; Ov. *Met.* 2.428; 12.530; 15.581; *Fasti* 1.87; Luc. 0; Mart. 0); it sounds rather odd in the mouth of a god addressing a simple mortal. On the other hand, it is very frequent in the *CLE*, particularly in those epitaphs in which the dead man addresses the passer-by; cf. P. Colafrancesco-M. Massaro, *Concordanze dei CLE*, Bari 1986, pp. 715–716.

Lygdamus' *salve . . . nam* recalls the Ovidian *salve . . . enim* in *Met.* 15.581–582, *«rex», ait «o salve! Tibi enim, tibi, Cipe, tuisque / hic locus et Latiae parebunt cornibus arces.*

43 cura deum: the use of *cura* to indicate the person or thing that is the object of someone's solicitous attentions first appears in Verg. *Ecl.* 1.57, *raucae, tua cura, palumbes.* Another echo of Virgil is the phrase *cura deum,* first applied to Anchises in Verg. *Aen.* 3.476; cf. also *cura deorum* in Stat. *Silv.* 4.2.15 (applied to Domitian) and Mart. 1.82.10 (applied to Regulus); *cura deum* in Ov. *Met.* 8.724 (of Philemon and Baucis), *cura deum di sint, et qui coluere, colantur,* applied, as in Lygdamus, to poets in *Am.* 3.9.17 and *Ars* 3.405 (cited above); cf. also Tib. 1.9.34, *Bacchi cura, Falernus ager.* In addition, in this same sense of "object of solicitous attentions", *cura* undergoes a significant development as an elegiac term to designate the beloved as the lover's only concern (use from Pl. *Epid.* 135; cf. *ThLL* 4.1475.42 ff. and Pichon, p. 120; see also Ov. *Am.* 1.3.16, *tu mihi . . . cura perennis eris*; 9.43; 2.10.12; 3.1.41; 9.32). On the term, cf. M. Hauser, *Der römische Begriff 'cura'*, Diss. Basel, 1954.

casto . . . poeta: *castus* is used of the individual who is morally pure and honest, and faithfully carries out his obligations in all aspects of life (towards the gods, family, country, etc.), its meaning coming close to that of *pius.* Of the *castitas poetarum* Ovid speaks in detail in *Ars* 3.539–550:

Adde, quod insidiae sacris a vatibus absunt,
et facit ad mores ars quoque nostra suos.
Nec nos ambitio nec amor nos tangit habendi:
contempto colitur lectus et umbra foro.
Sed facile haeremus validoque perurimur aestu
et nimium certa scimus amare fide.
Scilicet ingenium placida mollitur ab arte,
et studio mores convenienter eunt.
Vatibus Aoniis faciles estote, puellae:
numen inest illis, Pieridesque favent.
Est deus in nobis, et sunt commercia caeli:
sedibus aetheriis spiritus ille venit.

Note the terms suggesting the program for an elegiac life: *paupertas, otium, fides.*

The same phrase *castus poeta* is found in Catul. 16.5–6, *nam castum esse decet pium poetam / ipsum, versiculos nihil necesse est.* The *pius poeta* is the good poet, priest of the Muses; the bad poet, on the other hand, is impious towards the Muses, whose cult he profanes (cf. Catul. 14.1–7).

For the close relationship between poetic talent, *pietas* and the protection of the gods, cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.17.13–14, *di me tuentur, dis pietas mea / et Musa cordi est.* For the importance of the adjective *castus* and its meaning in Lygdamus, observe the extent to which it recurs (cf. 1.23; 4.23; 43; 60). Some commentators rightly see here a clear contrast between the *castitas* of Lygdamus (*castus poetas*, l. 43) and the *levitas* of Neaera (*nec gaudet casta nupta Neaera domo*, l. 60), who was still referred to as *casta* in 1.23; cf. Dissen 352–353; G. Lieberg, "Le muse in Tibullo e nel *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Prometheus* 6 (1980) 145.

nam: "for indeed", causal particle introducing the explanation or argument for the vocative *cura deum.* It normally appears at the beginning of its phrase (as in Lygd. 3.11; 22; 4.36 *namque*; 85), but in poetry after the *neoterici* it can sometimes be put back to the second position, rarely to the third or fourth; cf. Catul. 23.7 (with Fordyce 153); 37.11; 64.301; Hor. *Epod.* 14.6; 17.45; *Sat.* 2.3.20; 41; 302; 6.78; *Ep.* 2.1.186; *Od.* 4.14.9; Verg. *Ecl.* 9.39, *quis est nam*; *Ge.* 4.16; *Aen.* 1.444; 518; 731; 3.379; 4.421; 6.667; 10.585; never in Tibullus; in Propertius only once (4.8.23); in Ovid nine times (*Her.* 11.61; *Ars* 1.702; 3.53; *Fasti* 1.59; 4.64; *Tr.* 1.5.58; *Ponto* 2.1.53; 4.11.9); in the third position it is rare; however, cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.18.3, *siccis omnia nam dura deus proposuit*; Verg. *Aen.* 9.803; 12.206; on this point, see Lachmann 246 *ad* Lucr. 4.604; Norden, *Aeneis VI*, app. III, p. 403; Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, pp. 94–95; Kühner-Stegmann II.2.112; Hofmann-Szantyr 506 (§ 274 *Zus.* c); Ernout-Thomas 450–451 (§ 432), 453–454 (§ 435); Bassols II.115–116 (§ 121), 118 (§ 126); for the general tendency of Latin poetry to postpone the particles after the *neoterici*, in imitation of the Alexandrians, see the commentary on Lygd. 1.9 *sed.* With the sole exception of *etenim* (Lygd. 1.14), *nam* is the only explicative particle used by Lygdamus (cf. also 3.11; 22; 4.33; 85), as is the case with Tibullus, who always uses *nam* (some 18 times), never *enim* (unlike Ovid, where this particle is found around 100 times); for *enim/nam*, see Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, pp. 122–123; Hofmann-Szantyr 505 (§ 274 *Zus.* a).

rite: "in accordance with the rite"; an adverb which in prayers to the gods expresses the correct use of the contractual formula 'do ut des; facio ut facias', which in Roman religion regulates the relationship between men and gods: if the suppliant carries out the ceremony in accordance with the prescribed rite (cf. Liv. 1.8.1, *rebus divinis rite perpetratis*; 44.22.16, *sacrificio rite perpetrato*; Verg. *Aen.* 8.60, *Iunoni fer rite preces*; Ov. *Fasti* 5.595, *rite deo templumque datum nomenque bis ulto*;

OLD rite 1a), the deity is obliged to give a favourable welcome to his pleas, again in accordance with the rite (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.34–36, *Nymphas venerabar agrestis / Gravidumque patrem . . . / rite secundarent visus omenque levarent*; 10.254, *tu rite propinques augurium Phrygibusque adsis pede, diva, secundo*; Hor. *Saec.* 13, *rite maturos aperire partus lenis, Ilithyia, tuere matres*; *OLD rite* 1b). For the contractual nature of the relationship between suppliant and god in Roman religion (*do ut des, facio ut facias*), see Mart. 9.42, especially l. 11, *nata est hostia, Phoebe; quid moraris?*; J. Guillén, *Urbs Roma* III (Salamanca 1980) 44–45.

Alongside the religious use, another two profane uses are attested (*OLD rite* 3): 1) "with good results, well" (eg Pl. *Bacch.* 457, *hic enim rite productust patri* [*producere = educare*]; Verg. *Aen.* 3.107, *si rite audita recordor*); 2) "properly, following the custom" (eg Verg. *Aen.* 4.555, *rebus iam rite paratis*; 9.352, *religatos rite videbat / carpere gramen equos*); to these profane uses is added 3) the logical Ciceronian use "with reason, in justice" (*OLD rite* 4). In fact, the secular use seems to be the original one, although from early times a certain specialization in the sacred ambit can be observed. In Plautus (twice: *Bacch.* 457; *Poen.* 951) and Ennius (*Ann.* 613) *rite* only appears in sense 1; sense 2, which later on is quite familiar (almost *recte*), is not attested until the 1st c. BC, first in Lucr. 1.495 and Catul. 64.310, *aeternumque manus carpebant rite laborem* (sc. *Parcae*). In Cicero it appears 18 times, 5 of them in religious context, "following the rite" (*Domo* 134; *Har. resp.* 23; *Leg.* 2.19; 21; 3.9), the other 13 times with a logical meaning (derived in fact from sense 2), "with reason, in justice", only attested in Cicero and always in very specific expressions (*aliquem* or *aliquid rite nominare, dicere* or *habere*), for the most part scattered over his philosophical writings (*Rep.* 1.48; 56; 2.48; *Leg.* 1.22; 51; *Fin.* 2.37; *Senect.* 59; *Nat. Deor.* 1.52; 2.62; *Tim.* 33; *Off.* 1.16, *is prudentissimus et sapientissimus rite haberi solet*). In Livy and Ovid *rite* is almost exclusively found in a religious context. According to statistics by Bömer 393 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 7.798 the Ovidian use of *rite* without religious implications is limited to two passages of the total of fourteen: *Met.* 7.798 and *Her.* 7.108 (both in the context of marriage); cf. also Bömer 157–158 *ad* Ov. *Fasti* 3.234. In the *Odes* of Horace *rite*, again in a religious context, corresponds to *ut decet* (*Od.* 1.32.16; 4.6.37; 4.15.28). In Virgil *rite* appears fairly frequently (16 times), the religious use being the most frequent, as is only to be expected in a work dealing with the *pietas* of Aeneas, although, given the echoes of the ancients, the profane use, "as is the custom", is also found

(cf. *Aen.* 9.352, *religatos rite videbant carpere gramen equos*). On *rite*, its uses and its semantic evolution, see K.-H. Roloff, "*Ritus*", *Glotta* 33 (1954) 36–65.

In the present passage of Lygdamus *rite* is very close to profane use 2, "as is proper" and the Ciceronian "with reason", although the religious sense is underlying it, in that the gods named (Phoebus, Bacchus, the Muses) respond favourably to the poet because he was previously *castus* (for the religious sense of this term, cf. Lygd. 4.43 *casto* [comm.]).

44 Phoebusque et Bacchus Pieridesque: "Phoebus and Bacchus, as well as the Pierides". The same triad of poetic divinities appears in [Verg.] *Catal.* 9.59–60, *Cynthius et Musae, Bacchus et Aglaie*; Prop. 3.2.7 and 13–14; 4.6.75–76; Ov. *Am.* 1.3.11, *at Phoebus comitesque novem vitisque repertor* (with n. by McKeown 68); *Ars* 3.347–348 *sup. cit.*; Stat. *Silv.* 1.5.2; 5.1.25–26; cf. also Call. *Fr.* 191 (= *Iamb.* 1).7–8.

As regards the formulation, the correlation *-que et . . . -que* is striking, since the expected classical usage, this being a polysyndetic correlation of three or more terms, would be *(et) . . . et . . . et . . .*; cf. Kühner-Stegmann II.2.31; Ernout-Thomas 443 (§ 427); Bassols II.98–99 (§ 97). In fact, Lygdamus has replaced a three-member correlation (1 + 1 + 1) with a two-member scheme ([1 + 1] + 1), grouping together the gods (Phoebus and Bacchus) on one hand and leaving the Pierides on their own. The correlation *-que et* is already an archaism in the classical period, only used in poetry for its elevated style, particularly by Virgil and Tibullus (also Catullus [cf. H. Heusch, *Das Archaische in der Sprache Catulls*, Bonn 1954, pp. 158 ff.] and Hor. *Od.* 4.9.35; 4.14.46; *Poet.* 214; 444); cf. Hofmann-Szantyr 515 (§ 283 b); Ernout-Thomas 443–444 (§ 427). For the affirmative polysyndetic copulative correlation *-que . . . -que*, cf. Lygd. 1.4 *perque . . . perque* (comm.).

Phoebus: for this epithet of Apollo, cf. Lygd. 4.21 (comm.).

Bacchus: also called *Dionysus* and identified in Rome with the old Italic god *Liber Pater* (cf. Lygd. 6.1 [comm.]), Bacchus in the classical period is the god of wine, inspiration and mystical delirium. He is the son of Zeus and Semele, daughter of Cadmus, king of Thebes, and Harmonia. Already in the archaic period, Dionysus was honoured in Greece as patron of the dithyramb, tragedy and comedy; as god of Delphi he was associated with Apollo, and as mountain god, with the Muses (cf. S. *Ant.* 965; Paus. 9.30.1; *i.a.*); as the god inspiring poetry and protector of poetic activity, he is given epithets like Μουσαγέτης (*IG* 12.5.46; *RE* 5.1031) and Μελπόμενος (*RE* 15.589–590).

His wine is not only a subject for poetry but also helps in its composition (cf. Archil. 120 W.; Ar. *Ra.* 354 ff.). In addition, the philosophers connected poetic inspiration with the frenzy of the possessed (cf. Democr. *Fr.* 21, Ὅμηρος φύσεως λαχὼν θεαζούσης; Pl. *Io.* 533 e, οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἡ Μοῦσα ἐνθέους μὲν ποιεῖ αὐτή; *Phdr.* 245 a; R. Harriott, *Poetry and Criticism before Plato* [1969] 78 ff.; Pease *ad* Cic. *Div.* 1.80, *negat sine furore Democritus quemquam poetam magnum esse*; Russell *ad* Longin. 13.2; Brink 329 *ad* Hor. *Poet.* 295–298, *ingenium misera quia fortunatius arte / credit et excludit sanos Helicone poetas / Democritus*). Dionysus therefore shares this function of inspiring poetry with Apollo, but whereas the inspiration of Apollo is more restrained, the Dionysian variety is manifested in the form of delirium or poetic rapture: Dionysus helps to attain the condition necessary for inspiration, in a sense a state of "madness" coming from the gods (see L. Gil, *Los antiguos y la "inspiración" poética* [Madrid 1967] 65–70 and 82–87; Nisbet-Hubbard *Od.* II 316–317). On the role of Dionysus in archaic Greek literature, cf. G. A. Privitera, *Dionysus in Omero e nella poesia greca arcaica*, Roma: Ed. dell'Ateneo 1970. In the Hellenistic period, Callimachus not only associates Dionysus with Apollo and the Muses (*Fr.* 191.7–8 [= *Iamb.* 1.7–8]), but also regards him as responsible for poetic inspiration (cf. *Epigr.* 7 and 8 Pf. [= *AP* 9.565 and 566]). Among the Romans (with Nisbet-Hubbard *Hor.* II 316; Fedeli *Prop.* III 515), after a vague allusion in Lucr. 1.922–923, *sed acri / percussit thyrso laudis spes magna meum cor*, the motif of the god Bacchus as patron of poetry is taken up again with great enthusiasm by the Augustan poets, sometimes in connection with Apollo and the Muses: see Hor. *Od.* 2.19.1–2, *Bacchum in remotis carmina rupibus / vidi docentem*, and 9–16; 3.25, especially ll. 1–3, *quo me, Bacche, rapis tui / plenum? quae nemora aut quos agor in specus / velox mente nova?*; Prop. 2.30.37 ff.; 3.2.9, *nobis et Baccho et Apolline dextro*; 17, a hymn to Bacchus that is clearly inspired by Horace, according to the *communis opinio* (cf. M. Hubbard, *Propertius* [New York 1975] 72; J. F. Miller, "Propertius' Hymn to Bacchus and Contemporary Poetry", *AJPh* 112 [1991] 77–86); 4.1.62; 6.75 ff.; Ov. *Am.* 1.3.11–12 (cited in the previous n.); 3.1.23; 15.17; *Ars* 1.525, *suum vatem Liber vocat* (with Hollis 121); 3.347–348, *o ita, Phoebe, velis, ita vos, pia numina vatum, / insignis cornu Bacche novemque deae!*; *Fasti* 3.714; 789–790; *Tr.* 5.3.1 ff.; [Verg.] *Catal.* 9.59–60; Luc. *Civ.* 1.64–65; Stat. *Silv.* 1.5.3; 5.3.6. There was also the idea, frequently directed against Callimachus and his admirers, that the author of an imperishable poetic oeuvre must have composed under

the inspirational effects of wine (= Bacchus), while the work of the *aquae potores* (ὑδροπόται) would not survive the passing of time (Hor. *Ep.* 1.19.1 ff.). As for prophetic capabilities, Lygdamus reflects the general opinion among the ancients that only the gods who are *fatidici*, that is, those who pronounce oracles, know what the future holds in store. However, there are authors who cite Dionysus as a god who sees the future, and mention his sanctuaries and oracles; cf. Macr. *Sat.* 1.18; Paus. 9 (Boeotia) and 10 (Phocis, Delphi); Stat. *Theb.* 4.378, where a Baccha appears on stage issuing prophecies.

Bacchus is a "Fremdwort unbekannter Herkunft" (Frisk *GEW* I 212), probably originating like *Iacchus* from the "Kultepiklese" ἰὼ βάκχε; cf. H. S. Versnel, *Triumphus. An inquiry into the origin, development and meaning of the Roman triumph*, Diss. Leiden: Brill 1970, pp. 27 ff.; for the evidence of classical authors, cf. Maltby, *LALE*, p. 72.

Pieridesque favent: the same pentameter-ending in Ov. *Ars* 3.548, *infra cit.*

Pierides: for the Muses as *Pierides*, see Lygd. 1.5 (comm.).

favent: "are propitious"; the normal verb to express the special favour of one of the gods from Enn. *Ann.* 291, *Romanis Iuno coepit placata favere* (cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 4.10, [*nascenti puero*] *casta fave Lucina*; Tib. 1.10.30, *favente Marte*; 2.5.1 [= 3.10.19], *Phoebe, fave*); in connection with the gods of poetry and the poets, cf. Ov. *Ars* 3.548, *numen inest illis* (scil. *vatibus*), *Pieridesque favent*; *Fasti* 3.714, *Bacche, fave vati, dum tua festa cano*; Nemes. *Ecl.* 1.5, *versuque bonus tibi favit Apollo*; *ThLL* 6.1.374.40–43. See also the use of this verb in Lygd. 3.33 and 34, *adsis et timidis faveas, Saturnia, votis / et faveas concha, Cypria, vecta tua.*

45–48: Phoebus introduces himself as a prophetic deity, an attribution which singles him out against the other divinities who inspire poetry (ll. 45–48). Of all the gods who had poets under their protection, only he could help Lygdamus since he also possessed the gift of prophecy. For this reason, Apollo is sometimes given, in poetry, the title of *augur* or *vates* and the epithet *fatidicus* (see the commentary on Lygd. 4.49 *vates*). For Apollo as a classic oracular divinity, cf. A. *Eu.* 17–18; Call. *Ap.* 68–69; Verg. *Aen.* 3.251–252; 6.12; Hor. *Od.* 1.2.32; *Saec.* 61; Tib. 2.5.11–12 (with Murgatroyd 175); Ov. *Met.* 1.517–518; 3.8, *Phoebi . . . oracula* (with Bömer 447); Stat. *Theb.* 1.705–708, *tu doctus iniquas / Parcarum praenosse manus fatumque quod ultra est / et summo placitura Iovi, quis letifer annus, / bella quibus populis, quae mutent sceptra cometae*; Fontenrose 432.

45 proles Semelae Bacchus: an echo of Ov. *Met.* 3.520, (*dies aderit*)

qua novus huc veniat, proles Semeleïa (= 5.329; 9.641), *Liber* (with Bömer 573). However, the formulation has been poorly adapted, since in Ovid it makes full sense as part of an evocative prophecy of Tiresias to Pentheus; in Lygdamus, on the other hand, it is mere padding. Nor did the Ovidian expression *proles Semeleia* fit Lygdamus' line, in view of which Lygdamus had to renounce the adjective and fall back on the genitive of the noun; but which one, the Greek or the Latin noun? The mss. display divergences on this point. The earliest commentators (Muretus, Ach. Statius, *i.a.*) followed the Hellenizing form *Semeles*, which is present in the *recentiores*. Broukhusius was the first to introduce the Latinized form *Semelae* into the text (cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.19.2, *Thebanae . . . Semelae puer*). From then on, editors have been divided in their preferences for one form or the other (*Semeles*: Heyne-Wunderlich, Lachmann, Dissen, Müller, Hiller, Lenz-Galinsky, Smith, Luck, Lee; *Semelae*: Vulpius, Voss, De Golbéry, Baehrens, Postgate, Cartault, Pichard, Levy [Lenz], Ponchont, Tescari, Tränkle). Among the Roman poets, there is extensive use of the Greek genitive in *-es* in Catullus, Propertius and Ovid, while it tends to be avoided by Virgil, Horace and Tibullus (cf. Norden, *Aeneis VI*, p. 305). The homeoteleuton *proles Semeles* would suggest the 'lectio difficilior' *Semelae*.

The prolepsis of the apposition with respect to the noun it refers to is a poetic device introduced into Rome by the *neoterici* following classical Greek models (cf. E. *HF* 1377); cf. eg Verg. *Aen.* 8.377, *loca pervia, silvas*; Hor. *Od.* 1.1.6, *terrarum dominos . . . deos* (with Kiessling-Heinze 4); Ov. *Met.* 2.106, *Vulcania minera, currus*. A more refined and artistic form lies in intercalating the apposition between the noun and its determiner; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 1.57, *raucae, tua cura, palumbes*; *Aen.* 6.842, *geminos, duo fulmina belli, Scipiadas*; Ov. *Met.* 3.105, *iussos, mortalia semina, dentes*. Virgil and Horace are fairly moderate in its use; in Propertius and Ovid, on the other hand, it is employed unstintingly; cf. Norden 117 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 6.7–8, *densa ferarum / tecta . . . silvas*; Bömer 366 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.515; Hofmann-Szantyr 409.

proles Semelae: cf. E. *Ba.* 1 ff., ἥκω Διὸς παῖς . . . Διόνυσος, ὃν τίκτει ποθ' ἡ κάδμου κόρη Σεμέλη. The term *proles* is already a pure archaism in Ciceronian times (cf. *De or.* 3.153); among the Augustans its use is revived, though predominantly in poetry (Quint. *Inst.* 8.3.26, '*prolem' dicendi versu est ius*; historians like Caesar never use it, and Livy only in the first *Decade*; cf. Koestermann 47 *ad* Tac. *Ann.* 11.10.4). This poetic, or rather epic, use always evinces a solemn, majestic tone which prompted Cicero (*loc. cit.*) to include the term among

those words *quibus loco positis grandior atque antiquior oratio saepe videri solet*. Statistics for Ovid ratify its status as a term for elevated language, suitable for epic (*Met.-Fasti*: 47 / other works: 7). Frequently *proles* is strictly applied to gods and heroes of divine origins; cf. eg Verg. *Aen.* 6.25–26, *prolesque biformis / Minotaurus*; 322, *Anchisa generate, deum certissima proles* (scil. *Aeneas*); Hor. *Ep.* 1.7.4; Tib. 1.3.79, *Danai proles* (scil. *Danaides*); 4.7, *Bacchi . . . rustica proles* (scil. *Priapus*); Ov. *Met.* 2.19, *Clymeneia . . . proles* (with Bömer 243); 3.531, *proles Mavortia* (= *Tebani*); 7.404, *Theseus, proles ignara parentis*; 11.761, *proles . . . Dymantis* (scil. *Hecuba*); 12.72, *proles Neptunia Cycnus*; 189, *proles Elateïa Caenis* (with Bömer 69); 13.528, *proles gratissima matris* (scil. *Polydorus*); 14.320, *Picus . . . proles Saturnia*; *Fasti* 3.59, *Martia proles* (= *Romulus et Remus*); Sen. *Ag.* 215, *proles aequorei dei* (scil. *Cycnus*); Val.-Flac. 4.213; hence, when it is applied to simple mortals it has an encomiastic force; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.648, *genus antiquum Teucri, pulcherrima proles*; 784, *felix prole virum* (= the future Rome; with Norden 321; Austin 240–241); 7.691, *Messapus . . . Neptunia proles*; Hor. *Od.* 4.5.23, *laudantur simili prole puerperae*; 15.27 (both Horatian examples in the same context of praise of the new Golden Age under Augustus); [Verg.] *Cir.* 624, *optima proles* (= Amphion and his brother, who saved their aged parents from the lava of Mt. Etna); Ov. *Met.* 1.114, *argentea proles*; Val.-Max. 8.7.2, *cuius* (scil. *Cato senex*) *mirifica proles* (scil. *Cato Uticensis*) . . . *doctrinae cupiditate flagravit*; Luc. *Civ.* 6.420, *Sextus . . . Magno proles indigna parente* (here in praise of the father); in Tib. 1.7.55; 10.39; 2.2.21 the poetic flavour and solemn tone inherent in the term *proles* (= grandchildren) help to extol the joyous vision of old age which Tibullus wishes to transmit (cf. É. Évrard, "Vieux et ancien chez Tibulle", *Latomus* 37 [1978] 126; Lygd. 5.25–26 [comm.]). At other times, however, its use is not without a deliberate touch of humour; cf. Murgatroyd 134 *ad* Tib. 1.4.7, *Bacchi . . . rustica proles* (= *Priapus*). On the epic overtones of *proles*, see H. Reuschel, *Episches im Moretum und Culex*, Diss. Leipzig (1935) 21 ff.

For the description of Bacchus as son of Semele, apart from the *loci Ovidiani* cited in the previous note, cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.17.22, *Semeleius . . . Thyoneus* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 226); 19.2, *Thebanae . . . Semelae puer* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 239); Ar. *Th.* 991; E. *Ba.* 581; anon. *PMG* 879, Σεμελήι' Ἴακχε πλουτοδότα; Acc. *Trag.* 241, *Semela genitus*; Dracont. *Romul.* 10.587, *puer Semeleie Bacche*; *AL* 751, *Semeleie Bacche . . . laete Thyoneu*; cf. C. F. H. Bruchmann, *Epitheta deorum quae apud Graecos leguntur* (Leipzig 1893) 86, 90–92.

doctaeque sorores: ie *Pierides vel Musae*. *Doctus* is an adjective applied especially to poets and poetry (see the commentary on Lygd. 6.41 *doctus ... Catullus*), and therefore strictly applied to the Muses as divinities of poetic inspiration. For the neoteric expression, cf. Catul. 65.2, *doctis ... virginibus*; *Ars* 3.411–412, *doctis / ... Musis*; [Verg.] *Catal.* 9.2, *doctae ... Pegasides*; Ov. *Met.* 5.255 (with Bömer 286), *doctas ... sorores* (= *Fasti* 6.811; *Tr.* 2.13); Mart. 1.70.15, *quam Phoebus amet doctaeque sorores/*; 9.42.3, *doctae ... sorores*; 10.58.5–6, *doctas ... / Pieridas*; Sen. *Ag.* 336–337, *docta .../ Musa*; Manil. 2.49, *doctae cecinere sorores*; Stat. *Theb.* 4.182–183, *doctas ... / Aonidas*; 9.317, *doctae ... sorores* (with Dewar 120); *Carm. Eins.* 1.35, *doctarum turba sororum*. On the use of the term *sorores* in connection with different groups of mythological sisters, see the commentary on Lygd. 3.35 *tristesque sorores*.

46: an ironic contrast with the elevated hexameter preceding it: neither Bacchus, in spite of his lineage, nor the Muses, for all their wisdom, can see—note the opposition *doctae/non norunt*—even the immediate future (*hora sequens*), far less the distant future like Phoebus.

dicere non norunt: for the formulation, cf. Ov. *Her.* 6.124, *fallere non norunt*.

non norunt: "do not know, are ignorant of", litotes for 'ignorunt vel nesciunt'. *norunt* is the syncopated form of *noverunt*, a perfect with present force; cf. Hofmann-Szantyr 318 (§ 178 a); Ernout-Thomas 223 (§ 243 a); Bassols I.297 (§ 315).

quid ferat hora sequens: poetic reference to time; for the formulation, cf. Arn. 3.21 p. 12526, *quid cuique crastinus dies ferat aut hora*; cf. also Varro *Men. tit. ad Frg.* 333–340 (= Gell. 13.11.1; Macr. *Sat.* 2.8.2–3), *nescis quid vesper serus vehat*.

hora sequens: "the following hour". In expressions indicating the passing of time, the verb *sequi* denotes succession within chronological order; cf. Liv. 3.31.2, *sequente anno*. Only when the term qualified does not indicate a specific period within a time-keeping system (hours, days, months, years, etc.) does *sequi* imply a future idea, cf. Nep. *Thr.* 4.4, *sequenti tempore*; Verg. *Ecl.* 8.27, *aevoque sequenti*, "in the future"; Prop. 1.4.3, *vitae quodcumque sequetur*, "all life to come". As regards the term *hora*, there is no reason to take it *lato sensu* (= *aetas*), as Tränkle 123 argues, since, apart from the fact that this broad sense is only attested in verse inscriptions (cf. *CIL* 2.1413 [= *CE* 1069.4], *decuit talem longior hora virum*; 5.5343 [= Dessau 8471] 13; *CE* 1552 A 2; *ThLL* 6.3.2964.33–37), it would mean losing the negative connotation of the term *hora*, taken *sensu stricto* as "hour or short period of

time", within the formula *hora sequens* in contrast with the elevated *aevique futuri* ("all future time") of the following line.

sequens/: the only occurrence in Lygdamus of an adjectival participle at the end of a pentameter; for the restrictions affecting the last word of the pentameter, cf. Lygd. 1.6 *tamen* (comm.). Regarding the presence of a participle at the end of a pentameter (*sequens*), note the opinion of Serv. *Aen.* 3.300: *progredior portu, classes et litora linquens] notandum sane, finitum esse versum participio: quod raro apud Latinos est, apud Graecos vitiosissimum.* However, present participles at the end of a pentameter are not only found in Virgil, but also in Propertius (eg 3.16.24 [*sedens/*]; 20b.30 [*egens/*]; 4.8.68 [*latens/*]) and especially Ovid (eg *Ars* 3.258 [*potens/*]; *Fasti* 3.634 [*fremens/*]); never in Tibullus; cf. Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, pp. 45–47.

47–48: counterpoint to the preceding distich, as highlighted by the adversative particle *at.* As regards the formulation, Lygdamus has clearly based the distich on the words of Tiresias to Pentheus in Ov. *Met.* 3.336–338, *at pater omnipotens . . . scire futura dedit*; he has then expanded both the verb (*posse videre dedit*) and the complement (*fatorum leges aevique futuri / eventura*), principally through the influence of Tib. 2.5.11 (*tu* [scil. *Phoebus*] *procul eventura vides*), until a complete distich has been formed. The pompous and awkward syntax clearly reflects this method of composition. Note the zeugmatic construction of the infinitive *videre*, which should properly be taken with *eventura*, not with *fatorum leges*, where *scire* or *dicere* would be more to be expected. The stylistic monstrosity *aevi futuri eventura* is the result of contamination between the *futura* of Ov. *Met.* 3.338 and the *eventura* of Tib. 2.5.11. For the phrase *aevi . . . futuri*, cf. Lucr. 3.486, *aevo . . . futuro* (cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 8.627, *venturique inscius aevi*); for *eventura . . . videre*, apart from Tib. 2.5.11 (*sup. cit.*), cf. Ov. *Met.* 5.146, *sagax . . . ventura videre.* For *pater . . . videre dedit*, cf. Ov. *Met.* 3.336–338, *at pater omnipotens . . . scire futura dedit*; for the poetic expression *posse videre dedit*, where *dare* is used in the sense of *concedere* and *posse* is equivalent to a noun in the sense of "the ability to", the most obvious model is Ov. *Met.* 14.843–844, *quem si modo posse videre / fata semel dederint*; cf. also Lucr. 6.1227–1228; Tib. 1.8.56, *ipse dedit cupidis fallere posse deus* (with Murgatroyd 250); Ov. *Ars* 2.28, *da mihi posse mori*; *Met.* 11.177, (*Delius Midae auribus*) *dat posse moveri*; 12.556–558, *Periclymeni . . ., cui posse figuras / sumere, quas vellet, rursusque reponere sumptas / Neptunus dederat*; *Tr.* 1.1.34, *sedibus in patriis det mihi posse mori*; 3.1.23–24, *di tibi dent . . . / molliter in patria vivere posse tua.* For this use of *posse*, cf. also Ov. *Met.* 14.100, *posse queri tantum rauco*

stridore reliquit; Luc. *Civ.* 6.725, *a miser, extremum cui mortis munus inique eripitur, non posse mori.* For *dare* + infinitive used in poetry in the sense of *permittere, concedere* in relation to a gift or honour conceded by the deity, cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.486–487, '*da mihi* (scil. *Daphnei*) *perpetua, genitor carissime*', *dixit* / '*virginitate frui!* . . .'.; 3.338 (with Bömer 536); 5.619–620; 7.692. In archaic Latin, the construction *dare* + infinitive is only found with *bibere* (eg Pl. *Per.* 821, *bibere da*); in classical poetry the expression is extended to other infinitives (with which *dare* generally has the sense of *permittere, concedere*); first in Lucr. 3.1030, *iterque dedit legionibus ire per altum*; 6.1227; cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 1.66; 79; 319; 5.689; Hor. *Od.* 1.26.1 ff.; Tib. 1.8.56; Ov. *Ars* 2.28; *Met.* 1.486; 3.338 (with Bömer 536); 6.444; 11.177; 12.556–558; 14.696; *Tr.* 1.1.34; 3.1.23–24; *ThLL* 5.1.1688.59 ff.; Hofmann-Szantyr 345.

There are frequent references to the *fati lex, lex fatalis* or similar expressions in poetry and prose from Cic. *Tim.* 43, *imposuit commonstravitque leges fatales ac necessarias* (= νόμους τε τοὺς εἱμαρμένους) and Verg. *Aen.* 12.819, *illud . . . nulla fati quod lege tenetur*; cf. also [Verg.] *Cir.* 199, *crudeli fatorum lege* (with Lyne 183); Ov. *Met.* 3.316, *ea . . . fatali lege geruntur*; 10.203, *fatali lege*; Manil. 1.56, *fortunae leges*; 2.149; 642; 4.390 ff.; Val.-Max. 1.6.12, *invictae leges necessitudinis*; Sen. *Nat.* 1 *pr.* 3, *liceat illi* (scil. *deo*) *hodieque decernere et ex lege fatorum aliquid derogare*; 2.38.3; *Ag.* 706–707, *fatorum . . . leges* (with Tarrant 303); Luc. *Civ.* 2.82, *legibus aevi*; Val.-Flac. 4.709; *CLE* 386.4, *fati lex*; 1021.1, *fati lege*; 1530A.8, *fatorum lege.*

The idea that Apollo has received from his father Zeus the gift of predicting the future is familiar from *h. Merc.* 471–472, καὶ τιμάς σὲ δέ φασι δαήμεναι ἐκ Διὸς ὀμφῆς / μαντείας θ' Ἑκάεργε Διὸς πάρα, θέσφατα πάντα; cf. also A. *Eu.* 19, Διὸς προφήτες δ' ἐστι Λοξίας πατρός; *Fr.* 86 R.; Sch. S. *OC* 793; Verg. *Aen.* 3.251–252, *quae Phoebo pater omnipotens, mihi Phoebus Apollo praedixit*; Macr. *Sat.* 5.22.11 ff. Seen in this light, Apollo is a mere spokesman for Jupiter (*Iovis interpres*, Gr. ὑποφήτης). Luc. *Civ.* 5.77, on the other hand, attributes a different origin to the prophetic gifts of Phoebus:

> *Tu quoque vix summam seductus ab aequore rupem*
> *extuleras, uno iugo, Parnase, latebas.*
> *Ultor ubi expulsae, premerent cum viscera partus,*
> *matris adhuc rudibus Paean Pythona sagittis*
> *explicuit, cum regna Themis tripodasque teneret.*
> *Ut vidit Paean vastos telluris hiatus*
> *divinam spirare fidem, ventosque loquaces*

exhalare solum; sacris se condidit antris,
incubuitque adyto, ***vates ibi factus, Apollo.***

As Axelson rightly observes ("Lygd. & Ov.", p. 102), "dass sein Vater ihm die Sehergabe verliehen habe, ist eine befremdliche Auskunft im eigenen Munde des Sehergottes". This is the result of the direct adaptation of the words of Tiresias (Ov. *Met.* 3.336–338). On Apollo as prophet, cf. also Luc. *Civ.* 5.198–199, *custodes tripodesque fatorum arcanaque mundi / tuque, potens veri Paean nullumque futuri / a superis celate diem.*

aevi . . . futuri: for the phrase, cf. Tert. *Pud.* 13, *in isto et in futuro aevo.*

aevi: Gr. αἰών, ie *aetas perpetua*; cf. Varro *Lat.* 6.11; Paul. Fest. 13.3; Isid. *Orig.* 5.38.4; Maltby, *LALE*, p. 17; *ThLL* 1.1164.57 ff.

48 eventura: attested as a noun from Cic. *Div.* 1.29; cf. also Ov. *Ponto* 3.4.113; *Tr.* 1.9.41, *hoc eventurum*; for the nominalization of the neuter future participle, cf. Lygd. 4.5 (comm.).

pater: ie *Iuppiter*, biological father of Phoebus. Note too that *pater* is an epithet of Jupiter as "father of all gods and men"; cf. Enn. *Ann.* 175, *divum pater atque hominum rex*; 192, *pater optime Olympi*; Acc. *Trag.* 209, *caelestum pater*; Catul. 64.21, *pater ipse* (= Verg. *Ge.* 1.121; 328; *Aen.* 2.617); Verg. *Aen.* 10.875, *pater ille deum*; Hor. *Od.* 4.6.22; Liv. 8.6.5; Prop. 4.1.7; Sen. *Her. O.* 1587; Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.108. In fact, *pater* in itself can perfectly well indicate Jupiter; cf. Andr. *Carm.* 2, *pater noster, Saturni filie*; Verg. *Ge.* 1.121, *pater ipse colendi haud facilem esse viam voluit*; Hor. *Od.* 1.2.2, *iam satis terris nivis . . . misit pater*; Tib. 1.3.51, *parce, pater, . . .*; 4.23; Sil. 15.144, *bis terque coruscum addidit augurio fulmen pater*; *ThLL* 10.1.685.27–66; for *pater* applied to gods other than Jupiter, as a title of respect, see Verg. *Aen.* 3.89 and 11.789 (scil. *Apollo*); applied to Neptune in Verg. *Aen.* 5.14; 863; [Verg.] *Cir.* 72 (with Lyne 135); Sen. *Ag.* 553; Val.-Flac. 1.651; cf. Serv. *Ge.* 2.4, *'pater' licet generale sit omnium deorum, tamen proprie Libero semper coharet*; Serv. *Aen.* 1.699, *pater: omnium deorum epitheton est*; Serv. Auct. *Aen.* 1.155, *veteres omnes deos patres dicebant*; F. Marx, *C. Lucili Carminum Reliquiae*, 1905, comm. *ad* Lucil. 19–22 Marx (= 23–26 Krenkel), (*deorum consilium*) *ut nemo sit nostrum quin aut pater optimus divum, aut Neptunus pater, Liber Saturnus pater, Mars Ianus Quirinus pater siet ac dicatur ad unum*; Wissowa, *RuK*², pp. 26–27; Carter, *Epitheta deorum*, pp. 65–66; applied to Bacchus in Lygd. 6.38 *Lenaeus . . . pater* (comm.); *ThLL* 10.1.685.67–686.72.

videre: for the use of *videre* in connection with adivination, apart from Tib. 2.5.11 (*sup. cit.*), the obvious model for this passage, cf. Liv. 6.12.8, *si quid di vatesque eorum in futurum vident*; Ov. *Met.* 5.146, *sagax . . . ventura videre*; Stat. *Theb.* 1.398–399, *id volvens non ipse pater*

non docte futuri / Amphiarae vides (*nam vetat auctor Apollo*).

49–50: Phoebus demands Lygdamus' attention to hear the true prophetic message he is about to reveal to him. If we keep to the manuscript tradition (*quare ego quae dico non fallax accipe vates / quidque deus vero Cynthius ore ferat*), the distich presents serious difficulties: 1) dependent on *accipe* are two subordinate clauses, one a relative in the hexameter (*ego quae dico* . . .) and the other an indirect interrogative clause in the pentameter (*quid* . . . *ferat*). Both combinations are possible (cf. Prop. 4.8.74 for the relative clause; Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.233 for the indirect question), but the two clauses cannot be simultaneously dependent on the same introductory *accipe*; 2) the two clauses are virtually the same in content and therefore tautological. To solve the first problem the earliest editors adopted the reading *quodque* of some *recentiores* at the beginning of the pentameter, reducing the interrogative to a relative. The problem of the subjunctive *ferat* was solved by Broukhusius in modifying it to a future *feram*, in line with Verg. *Aen.* 3.252, *vobis Furiarum ego maxima pando.* The reading *quodque* . . . *feram* has been followed since then by modern editors. However, although this solves the syntactical problem, the question of the monotony of content remains. The only attempt to resolve this was unsuccessfully made by Postgate (*CQ* 6 [1912] 42), who proposed *quamque* . . . *ferar*: "how truth-speaking are the lips of the god of Cynthus"; later (*CQ* 10 [1916] 191), Postgate cited Ov. *Ponto* 2.7.23, *crede mihi, si sum veri tibi cognitus oris*, in support of his twofold conjecture. However, this support is irrelevant and rather inconclusive, in that—as was rightly pointed out by G. A. Fletcher ("Latin *Marginalia*", *CQ* 25 [1931] 50–51)—Ov. *Met.* 10.209, *talia dum vero memorantur Apollinis ore*, can equally serve to support *quodque* and *feram*. Subsequently, Tränkle 124—though misinterpreting Postgate's double conjecture *quamque* . . . *ferar* („ . . . und wie wahr man spricht, wenn man mich, den Kynthier, einen Gott nennt")—correctly shows that *vero* . . . *ore*, as in Ov. *Met.* 10.209, *sup. cit.*, the likely model for this passage (cf. also Ov. *Fasti* 6.425–426, *Smintheus* [scil. *Phoebus*] . . . / *hos non mentito reddidit ore sonos*), refers to the words of a god, not to what people say of him (for the expression *vero* . . . *ore*, cf. also Lucr. 6.6, *veridico* . . . *ex ore*; *Ponto* 2.7.23; Mart. 10.37.2, *veridico* . . . *ore*). Tränkle also proposes the opposite solution to the usual one with a view to obviating the syntactical problem in the distich: that these are not two relative clauses, but two indirect questions; accordingly *dicam* should be read in the hexameter, the *quidque* of the best mss. restored at the beginning of the pentameter

and, following Broukhusius, *feram* read at the end of it: "listen to what I say, the unerring seer, and what I, the Cynthian god, proclaim with truthful tongue". However, this syntactical solution likewise fails to solve the problem of the repetition of content. In my view, maintaining the most widely-accepted reading for the distich, *dico . . . / quodque . . . feram*, it has not been understood that each line corresponds to each of the two parts of the god's address. In the hexameter Phoebus alludes to the words he is immediately about to speak—hence the prospective present and the neuter plural relative *quae*—and in which he reveals to Lygdamus the infidelity of Neaera; in the hexameter, on the other hand, he refers to the prophecy with which he closes his address. Whereas in the hexameter he introduces himself as a poet (*vates*) who is telling Lygdamus no lies as he exposes his beloved, in the pentameter he acts as a prophesying god (*deus Cynthius*). The combination *ore . . . vero*, as in Ov. *Met.* 10.209 (*talia dum vero memorantur Apollinis ore*), alludes to the veracity of Apollo's prophecies. Apollo is νημερτής and ἀψευδής; cf. Ov. *Ars* 2.509–510, *sic monuit Phoebus; Phoebo parete monenti! / certa dei sacrost huius in ore fides.* The accuracy and infallibility of Apollo's oracular responses were proverbial; cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.7.28, *certus Apollo* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 107); Prop. 2.21.3, *sed tibi iam videor Dodona verior augur?*; Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 30 s.v. *Apollo*; for his oracles, cf. E. *Hel.* 148 ff.; for the use of the adjective *verus* in relation to the field of prophecy and fortune-telling, cf. Prop. 2.21.3 (*sup. cit.*).

49 quar(e) ego: elision of a long final vowel before a short initial vowel is quite rare; for the case of elision of a long final *-e* before an initial short *e-*, however, cf. *t(e) ego* in Prop. 2.20.11 and Ov. *Am.* 2.10.3; *cert(e) ego* is frequent in Ovid (about a dozen times); see Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, p. 74.

quare: ie *ergo*, causal-illative particle. In conjunction with imperatives (*accipe*) it has a conclusive ("and so") rather than a causal force and it introduces commands which are the fruit of previous reasoning, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 7.130–132, */quare agite et . . . /vestigemus et a portu diversa petamus* (cf. E. Löfstedt, *Les expressions du commandement et de la défense en Latin et leur survie dans les langues Romanes* [Helsinki 1966] 108–109). Thus particle is generally avoided in elevated poetry. Lucretius still made frequent and unlimited use of it; in Catullus, of 26 instances, only 3 belong to the *carmina docta*; but from the Augustan poets on, *quare* is avoided or used only in contexts where the *sermo communis* is present: never in Tibullus; in the *Corp. Tib.* only the

present Lygdamean example; in Horace only in the *Satires* and *Epistles*; in Virgil just 5 times and always in the fixed formulas *quare age*, *quare agite* (*Ge.* 2.35; *Aen.* 1.627; 7.130; 429; 8.273); Ovid uses *quare* not infrequently, though exclusively as an interrogative particle (= *cur*); for its relative frequency in Propertius, note 1.5.31–32, *quare . . . desine, Galle / quaerere*, where Propertius, because of the subject-matter and his familiarity with Gallus, deliberately introduces numerous expressions from ordinary language (with Fedeli *Prop.* I 167). In post-classical Latin a similar panorama can be observed: *quare* is found quite frequently in poets like Martial (cf. Kay 148 *ad* Mart. 11.36.2) and Juvenal (in the latter always = *cur*, as in the three occurrences in Seneca), while in the epic poets Lucan, Valerius Flaccus and Silius Italicus it is only used sporadically, and in the Virgilian formula *quare age* (*agite*). Cf. M. Haupt, *Opuscula* I (Leipzig 1875) 84–85; E. Löfstedt, *Philolog. Kommentar zur Peregr. Aeth.* (Uppsala 1911, repr. 1936) 324–325; Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, p. 80 n. 67; J. Herman, "*Cur*, *quare*, *quomodo*. Remarques sur la évolution des particules d'interrogation en latin vulgaire", *Acta Antiquae Acad. Sc. Hungaricae* 5 (1957) 371 ff.; Hofmann-Szantyr 541–542 (§ 295 *Zus.* ß). For his part, Williams (*Trad. & Orig.*, pp. 774–775), on the grounds that in the *Aeneid quare* always introduces "a concluding point in a speech" (and, in the only occurrence in the *Georgics* "the final section of the proemium"), deduces that "it is a word which belongs to the speaking voice and that it signals a change of tone". This, in the eyes of Propertius, would make it ideal for introducing "concluding distichs".

dico: in Lygdamus the *-o* of the 1st person singular of the present indicative is always scanned long (cf. 6.43), which is virtually the norm among the elegiac poets; cf. Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, pp. 51–52.

non fallax: litotes (= *verax*). For the phrase, cf. Cic. *Planc.* 22, *laudanda est . . . vicinitas . . . non fallax*; Ov. *Met.* 2.631, *non falsae praemia linguae*. A similar litotes applied to Apollo appeared in Verg. *Aen.* 6.343–344, *dic age* (scil. *Palinure*). *namque mihi* (scil. *Aeneae*), ***fallax haud*** *ante repertus, / hoc uno responso animum delusit* ***Apollo***, */ qui . . . canebat . . .*, the likely model for this passage of Lygdamus. *Fallax* is an adjective habitually applied to promises, and the prophecies of Apollo were considered *non fallaces* from Call. *Ap.* 68, θῆκαο δ' οἰωνῶν μέγ' ὑπείον ἀγγελιώτην; cf. also, in the passage of Virgil cited above, ll. 346–347, *'en haec promissa fides est?' / ille* (scil. *Palinurus*) *autem: 'neque te Phoebi cortina fefellit,/ . . .*; the same topos in Sen. *Ag.* 255, *famula veridicis dei*

(scil. *Phoebi*). For *fallax* 'de rebus incorporeis', cf. *ThLL* 6.1.179.48 ff.

accipe: imperative habitually used to introduce a story or a reply; cf. Ov. *Met.* 4.794, *accipe quaesiti causam*; 14.318–319, *accipe, . . . Macareu, dominaeque potentia quae sit, / hinc quoque disce meae* (with Bömer 113); *Fasti* 1.115, *accipe, quaesitae quae causa sit altera formae*; 2.513–514, *lux quoque cur eadem Stultorum festa vocetur, / accipe!*; 5.449, *accipe causam.* There is a similar use of *disce* (*discite*); cf. eg Ov. *Fasti* 1.101; 133; 2.584. Such commands are frequent in didactic poetry; cf. eg Lucr. 1.269 and 4.722 (*accipe*); Verg. *Ge.* 2.35 (*discite*); 3.414 (*disce*); Ov. *Ars* 3.298 (*discite*); *Rem.* 292 (*accipe*); *Medic.* 1 (*discite*); J. F. Miller, "Ovid's Divine Interlocutors in the *Fasti*", in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* III (1983) 166 n. 30.

vates: as an oracular divinity, Apollo is given in poetry the titles of *vates* (first in Verg. *Aen.* 6.12, *Delius . . . vates*; cf. also Ov. *Ars* 2.496; Sen. *Oed.* 230; 269; Lygd. 4.49; Val.-Flac. 4.445, *vates . . . Apollo*; Fontenrose II 455; *OLD vates* 1a) and *augur* (cf. Hor. *Saec.* 61; *Od.* 1.2.32; Verg. *Aen.* 4.376; Prop. 2.21.3; Fontenrose II 453; *OLD augur* 2a), or the epithet *fatidicus* (cf. Ov. *Fasti* 2.262, *fatidicum . . . deum*; Luc. *Civ.* 5.70, *fatidici . . . Phoebi*; Sil. 13.412, *fatidicam Phoebei pectoris umbram*; Sen. *Oed.* 269, *fatidica vatis ora Cirrhaeae*; 1042, *fatidice te . . . compello*; *Ilias* 31, *fatidici . . . sacras . . . aures*; Fontenrose I 443; *OLD fatidicus* a).

50 vero . . . ore: for the expression, in addition to the likely model for this passage (Ov. *Met.* 10.209, *talia dum* ***vero*** *memorantur Apollinis* ***ore***), cf. Lucr. 6.6, *veridico . . . ex ore* (scil. *Epicuri*); Ov. *Ponto* 2.7.23, *crede mihi, si sum veri tibi cognitus oris*; Mart. 10.37.2, *veridico . . . ore*; in connection with Apollo, cf. also Ov. *Fasti* 6.425–426, *Smintheus* [scil. *Phoebus*) . . . / *hos* ***non mentito*** *reddidit* ***ore*** *sonos.*

Cynthius: adjective applied to Apollo (and his sister Diana), "the one from *Cynthia*" from Hor. *Od.* 3.28.12 (cf. *ThLL Onom.* 2.792.83 ff.)—in the Greek context the occurrences are late and few in number, acording to Bömer 355 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.465—because he was born, according to mythical tradition, at the foot of *Cynthus*, the mountain which overlooks the whole of the island of Delos (cf. *h. Ap.* 17; 25 ff.; Ov. *Met.* 6.191–192; *Fasti* 5.692); cf. Paul. Fest. p. 52; Serv. *Aen.* 3.92; *Ecl.* 6.3; Philarg. Verg. *Ecl.* 6.3 rec. II; Serv. Auct. and [Prob.] *Ge.* 3.36; Maltby, *LALE*, p. 171. To this place came the young Leto, with child by Zeus and weary from having wandered the world over with no land having dared to welcome her, for fear of the power of the jealous Hera. Only the floating island of Ortygia (or Asteria) agreed to grant her exile, and Leto finally gave birth to Artemis and

Apollo. Out of gratitude, the latter secured the island in the centre of the Greek world and gave it the name of Delos, "the Shining one"; cf. Ruiz de Elvira, *Mitología clásica*, pp. 76–78. *Cynthius* (Gr. Κύνθιος) as a title or ἐπίκλησις of Apollo (shared by Zeus, although less so) is frequent in Hellenistic poetry (eg Call. *Del.* 9–10, Ἀπόλλων / Κύνθιος), from where it spread to Augustan poetry through Verg. *Ecl.* 6.3; *Ge.* 3.36; cf. also [Verg.] *Catal.* 9.60; Hor. *Od.* 1.21.2, *intonsum . . . Cynthium* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 256); Prop. 2.34.80; Ov. *Ars* 2.239; *Fasti* 3.346 and 353 ('pro Sole'); Paul. Fest. p. 52M; *Buc. Eins.* 1.17; cf. Bruchmann, *Epitheta Deorum* s.v.; Carter, *Epitheta Deorum*, 1893/1902 s.v.; Liddell-Scott s.v.; Wernicke, *RE* 2.57.58 ff. 1391; Prehn, *RE* 12.41.41 ff.; Fontenrose I 437–438, 443; II 454; *ThLL Onom.* 2.792.68–81.

feram: a verb characteristic of the sphere of adivination, inasmuch as the prophet, as bearer of news, limits himself to transmitting the reply of the god Apollo; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.82, *ostia . . . patuere . . . vatisque ferunt responsa per auras* (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.474, *Phoebi interpres* [scil. *vates Helenus*]; 9.369, *Turno regi responsa ferebant*). Apollo for his part is also a mere spokesman for Jupiter (*Iovis interpres*; cf. ll. 47–48 [comm.]); the verb is therefore appropriate here. For *ferre* in the sense of *nuntiare, referre, docere*, cf. *ThLL* 6.1.543.63 ff.

51–60: an unusually long sentence (ten lines) in which Apollo reveals to Lygdamus the perfidy of his beloved Neaera. The manner chosen to stress her lack of gratitude for the noble behaviour of Lygdamus is to portray her ungrateful betrayal against the background of the *amor, cura et fides* of the poet (pathopoeia): while he professes his boundless love for her (ll. 51–52), continually prays to the gods on her behalf (l. 53), and makes her the object of his concern both day and night (ll. 54–56), as well as the muse inspiring his poetry (l. 57), she, in contrast, only thinks of another man (ll. 58–60). The unequal number of lines devoted to each of them further underlines the contrast between the conduct of the two. The syntactical model for the passage is undoubtedly Catul. 37.11–14a, *puella nam mei, quae meo sinu fugit, / amata tantum quantum amabitur nulla, / pro qua mihi sunt magna bella pugnata, / consedit istic*. Note the similar declarations of *amor* and *officia amoris*, as well as the linguistic echoes *tantum . . . quantum* (ll. 50–51) and */pro qua* (l. 53). Lygdamus has only expanded the period and considerably held back the mention of the subject, thus maintaining the suspense to the end. The passage is full of Catullan echoes and cross-references to other elegies of the author.

As regards the inordinate length of this period (5 distichs), it should be noted that, although it is true that as a general rule the elegiac poets make the end of the sentence coincide with the end of the pentameter, thus constituting what has come to be known as the "unity of sense of the elegiac distich", it is also the case that it is relatively frequent for these same elegiac poets to delight in the construction of long sentences surpassing the limits of their distich and invading the following one, on a very few occasions going so far as to encompass four or five distichs; cf. Prop. 1.2.1–5; 2.1.71–78; 3.2.39–46; Ov. *Her.* 7.157–163; *Tr.* 2.155–180; Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, pp. 27–33.

51–52: declaration of boundless love, with motherly love and sexual passion as emphatic terms of comparison. The model is undoubtedly Catul. 72.3–4, *dilexi tum te non tantum ut vulgus amicam / sed pater ut gnatos diligit et generos.* As for the formulation of the simile, the model *tantum cara tibi quantum nec . . . quantum nec* with the negative form of the 2nd term ("loved like no other") also has a clearly Catullan feel to it; cf. Catul. 8.5, *amata nobis quantum amabitur nulla*; 37.12, *amata tantum quantum amabitur nulla*; 87.1–2, *nulla potest mulier tantum se dicere amatam / vere, quantum a me Lesbia amata mea es*; Hor. *Od.* 2.5.17–18, *dilecta, quantum non Pholoe . . . / non Chloris* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 89, who cite Hom. *Il.* 14.315 [Zeus to Hera]). Note the homoeoteleuton *bella puella* and the parallel phrases at the end of the lines, *filia matri* and *puella viro.* For the contents of the pentameter, cf. Varro *Men.* 482, *quid . . . est quod homo . . . lubentius videre debeat bella uxore?*, and—as was well noted by L. Alfonsi, *Albio Tibullo e gli autori del 'Corpus Tibullianum* (Mailand 1946) 68—Catullus once again in 70.3, *dicit; sed mulier cupido quod dicit amanti / . . .* For the combination *puella viro* at the end of the pentameter, cf. l. 58 below, *puella viri.*

tantum . . . quantum nec . . . / quantum nec: this form of correlative comparison is neither classical nor frequent. In the first place, a comparison of superiority of the type 'magis amata quam' has been transformed into an equal comparison in which two terms appear together as equivalent even though one of them—the first—possesses a quality to a greater degree than the other, the second (cf. Bassols II.306–307 [§ 296]); secondly, the form *tam . . . quam,* the most usual way to establish equal comparison, has been replaced by *tantum . . . quantum* (cf. Bassols II.305 [§ 295]), with the result that, instead of the expected expression 'tam cara quam nec . . . nec' we are faced with the striking 'tantum cara quantum nec . . . quantum nec'.

52 cupido bella puella viro: the expression *cupido . . . viro* with interposition of an adjective followed by a noun is only found in Ov. *Am.* 2.5.26, *sed tulerit cupido mollis amica viro*; and the expression *bella puella* interposed between an adjective and a noun only occurs (again in reference to sexual pleasure) in Ov. *Am.* 1.9.6, *hos petit socio bella puella toro*; cf. G. Baligan, "Ancora su Ligdamo", *Aevum* 24 (1950) 283.

cupido . . . viro: the adjective *cupidus* after Catullus describes the passionate lover, avid for carnal pleasure ("ardent", "lecherous"); in this sense it was a poeticism until Silver Latin; cf. Catul. 61.54; 64.147; 374; 70.3; Tib. 2.5.54, *cupidi . . . dei* (con Murgatroyd 201); [Tib.] 3.9[= 4.3].18, *Veneris cupidae gaudia*; Stat. *Theb.* 7.299, *puerum . . . Dircetis . . . cupido violavit amore*; cf. also Pichon, pp. 119–120; *ThLL* 4.1427.10 ff.; 83 ff. At times, in fact, even the substantivized adjective is in itself sufficient to refer to the "lover" in the fullest sexual sense of the term; cf. Tib. 1.8.56; 74; 9.57–58, *semper sint externa tuo vestigia lecto, / et pateat* **cupidis** *semper aperta domus* (with Murgatroyd 271); [Tib.] 3.12.11; Ov. *Ars* 3.674; *ThLL* 4.1427.21–24. For the phrase *cupido . . . viro*, cf. [Verg.] *Priap.* 16.6; Ov. *Am.* 2.5.26, (*oscula*) *tulerit cupido mollis amica viro*; *Ars* 3.88, *gaudia nec cupidis vestra negate viris*; cf. also Catul. 64.374, *dedatur* **cupido** *iam dudum nupta* **marito** (= [Verg.] *Priap.* 3.7; Ov. *Fasti* 4.153; Mart. 11.178.5); 70.3, *mulier* **cupido** *quod dicit* **amanti** (= [Verg.] *Cir.* 78; Prop. 2.33.5; Ov. *Her.* 3.26; 19.67; *Ars* 1.420; *Rem.* 611; *Met.* 4.679); for the animal world, cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.6.56, *oscula dat cupido blanda columba mari*.

bella puella: unlike the elevated *pulcher*, "beautiful", the adjective *bellus*, "pretty", belongs to colloquial, familiar language (cf. Hofmann, *Latin familiar*, pp. 212–213 [§ 130]), as is attested by its use in literature, where it is restricted almost exclusively to the comedies of Plautus (27 times; in the more polished Terence only once); also in the satires of Lucilius (3), Horace (1) and Persius (2), never in Juvenal; Petronius (10), Cicero's letters (28) and the *carmina brevia* of Catullus. Though used 15 times by Catullus (see D. O. Ross, *Style and Tradition in Catullus* [Cambridge 1969] 110–111), it is rare in the Augustan poets: the elevated poetry of Virgil, Horace, Propertius and Ovid avoids this adjective altogether (apart from two satires of Horace and Ov. *Am.* 1.9.6, *hos* [scil. *annos*] *in socio bella puella viro!*). Its elegiac use (cf. Pichon, p. 93) is reduced to three appearances in the *Corp. Tib.* (Tib. 1.9.71; the present passage, Lygd. 4.52, and [Tib.] 3.19 [= 4.13].5), as well as the already mentioned *hapax legomenon* in Ovid. This strikingly restricted use by the elegiac poets of the adjective

bella in place of the usual *formosa* to describe the captivating beauty of the elegiac beloved (see the commentary on Lygd. 1.7 *formosae*) undoubtedly stems from Catul. 8.16, *cui videberis bella?*; witness the linguistic echoes in Tib. 1.9.71, *iuveni cuidam vult* ***bella videri***, and [Tib.] 3.19 [= 4.13].5, *atque utinam posses uni mihi* ***bella videri*** (for the fate of this expression, cf. also Publ.-Syr. Q 32, *quae* ***vult videri bella*** *nimium illi negat*). In the only instance in Ovid, since the context is one of *militia amoris*, McKeown 263 adduces for the choice of *bella* an etymologizing association with *bellum* ("war"). The phrase *bella puella* appears in the same place in the pentameter in Catul. 69.8, *nec quicum bella puella cubet*; 78.4, *cum puero ut bello bella puella cubet*, and the above-mentioned Ov. *Am.* 1.9.6 (with the same pentameter-ending, *bella puella viro/*). The signs are that it is a fixed formula (cf. also Cic. *Att.* 1.1.4, *puellae Caeciliae bellissimae*; Catul. 43.6 (*puellam*) *bellam*; Petr. *Satyr.* 25.2, *puella satis bella*; Sen. *Ben.* 1.4.4, *bellis puellis*; Mart. 1.64.1 and 4; 2.87.1, *bellas . . . puellas*). For the poetic use of *bellus* in Latin literature, cf. Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, p. 35; as regards the present Lygdamean use, Axelson ("Lygd. & Ovid", p. 103 n. 1) sees in it conclusive proof that Lygdamus is an imitator of Ovid (copying *Am.* 1.9.6); on the other hand, Büchner ("Lygdamus", p. 508) regards this word, which is very much to the taste of the *neoterici*, as clear testimony of Lygdamus' admiration for Catullus and an indication that the two authors lived at much the same time.

For *bella* 'de muliebris, puellis', cf. *ThLL* 2.1856.50–68 (62–64 for the combination *bella puella*). On the meaning and use of the term *puella* in elegy, see Lygd. 2.1 (comm.). For the homoeoteleuton *bella puella*, cf. eg Cic. *Carm. Frg.* 12 Büchner, *fortunatam natam*; Prop. 2.8.16 (= Ov. *Met.* 14.715; *Tr.* 5.8.8), *verba superba*; 9.41, *matutina pruina*; [Tib.] 3.10.1, *expelle puellae*; Ov. *Am.* 1.15.18, *blanda Menandros*; *Met.* 2.755, *arcana profana*; 4.522, *Melicerta lacertis*; 6.37, *confecta senecta*; 7.80, *scintilla favilla*; 538, *miratur arator*; 8.526, *iuvenesque senesque*; Sen. *Ben.* 1.4.4, *bellis puellis*; Tac. *Ann.* 14.59.2, *Pelagone spadone*; Housman *ad* Luc. *Civ.* 4.219, *vita petita est*; Hofmann-Szantyr 706–707 (§ 10 II).

puella viro: for the combination at the end of a pentameter, cf. Lygd. 4.58, *puella viri/*.

53: echo of Lygd. 3.1–10 and 27. Lygdamus' prayer to the gods is to be able to share the blessing of a long life together with Neaera. For the formulation, cf. Ov. *Met.* 9.682–683, *Telethusa maritum / sollicitat precibus*, where the pleas, however, are addressed to a mortal, and also Luc. *Civ.* 1.63 ff., *nec . . . Cirrhaea velim secreta moventem sollicitare*

deum, and Sil. 6.561–562, (*deos*) *seris* ... *sollicitant precibus*. The model for this use of *sollicitare deos/numina precibus/votis*, "to importune the gods with prayers", was the use—widespread after Lucretius—of the expression *deos* (*numina, caelum*) *fatigare* (cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.2.26; Prop. 2.20.3; Liv. 27.50.5; Sen. *Ep.* 31.5; Stat. *Theb.* 2.244; *i.a.*).

pro qua ... votis: "with prayers for whom", that is, "prayers on behalf of Neaera, for her health". In this connection, and for the phrase *pro* ... *votis*, cf. [Tib.] 3.10.12, *votaque pro domina vix numeranda facit*; Ov. *Tr.* 1.9.3, *utinam pro te possint mea vota valere*. It is presumably, then, further testimony of the *fides* of the *officiosus amator*. However, bearing in mind the desire underlying the whole cycle for the return of Neaera, and the insistent prayers to the gods begging this favour in Lygd. 3.1–10 and especially l. 27, *pro dulci reditu quaecumque voventur*, the present line could well be interpreted in the sense of "prayers in return for her, for her return".

caelestia numina: ie *caelestes deos*. The adjective *caelestes* is properly applied to the *dei superi* as opposed to the *dei inferi* (cf. *ThLL* 3.67.63 ff.). On *numen*, see C. Bailey, *Religion in Virgil* (Oxford 1935) 60 ff. *Numen* strictly denotes divine will, as can be seen in Verg. *Aen.* 7.583–584, *contra omina, contra fata deorum, perverso numine*. Normally *numen* is used with the genitive of the deity in question (an expression confirmed by its use in the republican period). In imperial times, *numen* sometimes denotes not only the effective power of the deity but the deity himself, in place of *deus*, precisely because the Augustan poets tend to emphasize the power of the god (Verg. *Aen.* 1.8, *quo mumine laeso*); cf. Bömer 131–132 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 1.411; 339 *ad* 2.395; Pfister, *RE* 17.2 1278.21 ff.; H. Wagenvoort, "De dea Cerere deque eius mysteriis Romanis", *Mnemosyne* 13 (1960) 116 ff.; R. Schilling, "L'originalité du vocabulaire religieux latin", *Rites, cultes, dieux de Rome*, Paris 1979, pp. 46–47 (= *RBPh* 49 [1971] 47–48). The term reappears in Lygd. 5.29; 6.22.

For the expression, cf. [Verg.] *Aetna* 339, *caelestia numina ture placare*; Liv. 8.6.5, *caeleste numen*; Ov. *Her.* 20(19).183, *non bove mactato caelestia numina gaudent*; Val.-Max. 7.25, *caelestis numinis providentia*; Apul. *Met.* 9.34, *numinum caelestium* ... *minis*.

54: the cares of love (*curae*), probably arising from the *discidium* from Neaera, anxiety over the possible existence of a rival and the desire for his loved one's return all cause Lygdamus great distress. The key to the *securos* of this line is Lygd. 3.31–32, *liceat mihi* ... / ***securo*** *cara coniuge posse frui*.

tibi: 'dativus sympatheticus' (= *tuos dies*). This dative, generally represented by personal pronouns, less often by nouns, is similar in meaning to a possessive genitive (or adjective), but is more expressive, as it does not depend on a noun but is indirectly related to the verb. This construction is quite common in archaic Latin, its use declining in classical prose but regaining importance in late Latin; cf. Hofmann-Szantyr 94–96 (§ 67 b); Bassols I.106–107 (§§ 96–97).

securos . . . dies: *securos* is used predicatively with *dies*. For the Lygdamean sense of the term *securus*, see the commentary on Lygd. 3.32. For the phrase, Fletcher 49 refers to Mart. 5.20.1–2, *si tecum mihi, care Martialis, / securis liceat frui diebus* and Plin. *Pan.* 68.2, *securus tibi et laetus dies exit.*

sinit: the verb *sino* can be used with both the accusative and infinitive (from *Carm. Arv.* 4 [= *CIL* I² 2]), and the completive *ut* construction; cf. Hofmann-Szantyr 353 (§ 194) and 530 (§ 289 I i α); Ernout-Thomas 329 (§ 328) and 302 (§ 308); Bassols II.184 (§ 186.7) and 221 (§ 215 e).

ire dies: the use of *ire* ("to go by") in expressions indicating the passing of time is predominantly poetic; cf. Pl. *Ps.* 240a, *it dies*; Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.55, *anni . . . euntes*; Ov. *Am.* 1.6.24, *tempora noctis eunt*; *Ars* 3.62, *eunt anni more fluentis aquae*; *Her.* 1.8, *tardos ire . . . dies*; *Met.* 1.682–683, *euntem . . . diem* (with Bömer 204); 2.331, *isse diem sine sole*; *Fasti* 1.26; 2.2; 575, *tertius ibat annus*; 3.145; 4.673, *diem properantius ire*; *Tr.* 2.142, *nube solet pulsa candidus ire dies*; *Ibis* 626, *nox tibi talis eat*; Sen. *Dial.* 6.6.2, *eat omnis inter luctus dies*; Mart. 12.98.6, *annus eat*; Apul. *Met.* 1.14, *nox ibat in diem*; the earliest examples in prose are Sen. *Suas.* 3.1; Sen. *Ep.* 108.25; cf. *ThLL* 5.1.1045.31 ff.; 5.2.645.16 ff. Nevertheless, *abire* 'de tempore' is the most frequent term (cf. *ThLL* 1.69.79 ff.).

dies: in principle there is nothing to prevent it from being interpreted *latiore sensu* as "days", in the sense of the union of day and night (*OLD dies* 3; *ThLL* 5.1.1028.70 ff.). However, the clear reference to night in the following distich (ll. 55–56) suggests that this line should be understood as referring exclusively to the day as the period of sunlight, as opposed to the night (*OLD dies* 1a; *ThLL* 5.1.1024.77 ff.).

55: an epic-style chronological periphrasis very much to Lygdamus' taste (cf. above ll. 17–18 [comm.] and 21) to refer to night. The image of Sleep wrapping someone up in a black cloak is apparently only found in Lygdamus. However, the Roman poets, under the influence of the Alexandrians (cf. Call. *Del.* 234, ὅτε οἱ ληθαῖον ἐπὶ

πτερὸν Ὕπνος ἐπείσῃ; Mel. *AP* 5.174.2; *Orph. Arg.* 1014; Nonn. *D.* 5.411), do make relatively frequent use of the metaphor of the wings of Sleep touching or covering the sleeper (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 5.861; Prop. 1.3.45, *dum me iocundis lassam Sopor impulit alis*; Ov. *Met.* 8.823–824, *lenis adhuc Somnus placidis Erysichtona pennis / mulcebat* [with Bömer 258]; 11.650 [*Morpheus*]; Sil. 10.344; Stat. *Theb.* 10.148–149; *Ach.* 1.620; *Silv.* 5.4.16; Fronto p. 229.18 Naber [= 218.8–9 Van den Hout], *Iuppiter alas . . . Somno adnexuit*; Corip. *Ioh.* 3.456; 7.15; *ThLL* 1.1466.39–46; Roscher s.v. *Hypnos* p. 2848), these wings occasionally being described as black (cf. Tib. 2.1.89–90, *postque* [scil. *Noctem*] *venit tacitus furvis circumdatus alis* [con Murgatroyd 67–68]; Claud. *Carm.* 5.325, *nigrasque Sopor diffuderat alas*; cf. asimismo E. *Hec.* 71, μελανοπτερύγων . . . ὀνείρων; Nonn. *D.* 31.175), like those of Death (cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.58, *Mors atris circumvolat alis*). The dark or black cloak strictly belongs to Night (cf. E. *Io.* 1150, μελάμπεπλος δὲ νύξ; *Alc.* 843–844 Θάνατον), as is attested by the Flavian poets (cf. Stat. *Theb.* 3.415–416, *nox . . . nigro . . . polos involvit amictu/*; Sil. 5.36, *atrae noctis amictu*; 12.613, *terras caeco nox condit amictu/*; 15.284; cf. also Avien. *Arato* 35; 1391; 1551; Claud. *Carm.* 27.6; Cypr. Gall. *Ex.* 351; *ThLL* 1.901.22–24). The transferal of the metaphor of the dark cloak of Night to the image of Sleep was a feasible one in that, for one thing, Sleep and Night already shared the metaphor of the black wings (for Night, cf. Ar. *Av.* 695, μελανόπτερος Νύξ; Verg. *Aen.* 8.369, *Nox fuscis tellurem amplectitur alis*; Manil. 3.194; 5.60; Avien. *Arato* 674; Fort. *Carm.* 8.3.235; *ThLL* 1.1466.32–36; cf. also *Inc. trag.* 132, *fuscis crinibus Nox*; for Sleep, cf. the *loci* cited above) and, in addition, Virgil had already removed the cloak metaphor from the exclusive ambit of Night to apply it to the image of a thick mist (cf. *Aen.* 1.412, *gradientis . . . multo nebulae circum dea fudit amictu*; cf. also Val.-Flac. 6.745; Avien. *Arato* 1725; *Ora* 387). Moreover, Lygdamus might have been influenced (with Axelson, "Lygd. & Ovid", p. 103; *pace* Büchner, "Lygdamus", p. 508) by Ovid's famous description of the *domus Somni*, in which there is mention of the "dark cloak" acting as a blanket on the bed of the god of sleep (cf. *Met.* 11.611 [*torus*] *pullo velamine tectus*); this hypothesis is confirmed by the fact that the epithet *ignavus* which Lygdamus applies to Sleep in l. 81 is only found precisely in this Ovidian ἔκφρασις of the *domus Somni* (cf. l. 593, *ignavi domus et penetralia Somni*).

For the line-ending *velavit amictu/*, cf. eg Catul. 64.266, *vestis . . . pulvinar complexa suo velabat amictu/*; Verg. *Aen.* 3.545, *velamur amictu/*; 8.33, *velabat amictu/*; [Verg.] *Cir.* 250, *se velabit amictu/* (with Lyne

205); Ov. *Ars* 3.179, *croceo velatur amictu/*; *Met.* 10.1, *croceo velatus amictu/*; 14.263, *circumvelatur amictu/* (with Bömer 96); *Fasti* 3.363, *caput niveo velatus amictu/*; Val.-Flac. 1.659; Stat. *Silv.* 2.1.132 (for the expression, cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 3.405, *velare . . . amictu/*); for other late and medieval *loci*, cf. Schumann, *LHL* V, pp. 517–518. Note how in this phrase *amictu* is always found at the end of the hexameter, as is habitual practice ('in heroicis versibus [140] substantivum semper ultimam versus occupat sedem', *ThLL* 1.1899.38–39); cf. eg Catul. 64.64, *non contecta levi nudatum pectus amictus/*. According to statistics by Bömer (96 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 14.263), Ovid uses *amictus* 17 times, 15 of them at the end of a line (the exceptions being *Ars* 3.268 and *Ponto* 2.5.52).
56: the image of Neaera is never far from Lygdamus, even in his dreams. That is, by day he thinks about her; at night he dreams of her. She is always present, as testimony of his devotion.

nocturnis . . . imaginibus: for the phrase, cf. Varro *Men.* 427, *somnurnas imagines*; Hor. *Od.* 4.1.37, *nocturnis . . . somniis*. For the use of *imago* to refer to an illusory nocturnal apparition, cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.27.40–42, *ludit imago / vana quae . . . / somnium ducit*; Verg. *Aen.* 1.353, *in somnis inhumati venit imago coniugis*.

vanum: scil. *te*, "senseless, foolish, naive"; cf. Ov. *Met.* 14.138; Juv. 14.211, *dic, o vanissime, quis te festinare iubet?*. Pregnant sense of *vanus* stemming from expressions like Verg. *Aen.* 10.630–631, *ego veri / vana feror*; Sil. 12.261, *voti vanus*. For the combination *vanum . . . fallit*, cf. Ov. *Ponto* 2.9.29, *vana laborantis si fallit vota coloni*.

fallit: "deceive, lead into error, pass as genuine"; cf. Lucr. 5.62, *simulacras solere in somnis fallere mentem*.
57–58: Verg. *Ecl.* 10.21–23 is the recognized model for the Lygdamean distich: *venit Apollo, / 'Galle, quid insanis?' inquit 'tua cura Lycoris / perque nives alium perque horrida castra secuta est'*; cf. introduction to the elegy.
57: echo of Lygd. 1.7–8. For the formulation, cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.10.59–60, *est quoque carminibus meritas celebrare puellas / dos mea*. Some authors, after Heyne, deduce from this line that Lygdamus probably dedicated to Neaera other poem-cycles that have not survived.

formosa Neaera: on the poetic use of the adjective *formosus*, see the commentary on Lygd. 1.7 (*formosae*).
58: for the phraseology of this line, cf. Ov. *Rem.* 772, *esse quod alterius coeperat illa viri*.

alterius . . . viri: "The rival is one of the stock figures of Roman love poetry" (Nisbet-Hubbard 372 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 1.33.3). In the eyes of the elegists, the rival is always a born winner, a conqueror who bases

his irresistible powers of attraction over elegiac women (*avarae puellae*) on his irresistible wealth (*dives amator*), parucularly his exotic and costly *munera*, against which the *carmina* of the elegiac poets (*pauperes*) are of no avail; on this point, see the chapter on the *dives amator* in Navarro, *Amada codiciosa*, pp. 58–66 (≈ *Habis* 22 [1991] 215–218).

alterius: ie *alii* (= *rivalis*); *alter* is almost a technical term to refer to the rival in love ("the other man"); cf. Prop. 1.3.35–36; 2.8.5, *possum ego in alterius positam spectare lacerto?*; 9.2; 21.17; 4.5.40; Tib. 1.5.17; Ov. *Am.* 2.5.53, *torqueor infelix, ne tam bona senserit alter*; *Her.* 7.19, *alter amor*; Stat. *Silv.* 3.5.4 (with Laguna 350); *alius* can also be used in the same sense; cf. Prop. 2.14.21; Ov. *Am.* 3.7.80; Lygd. 4.80. For the use of *alter*, "the other (of two)", in place of *alius*, "the other (among several)", first attested in Ov. *Fasti* 2.224 (*nec metus alter inest*), then predominant in late Latin and the Romance languages, cf. Kühner-Stegmann 2.1.650; Hofmann-Szantyr 208 (§ 111); Ernout-Thomas 199 (§ 221); Bassols I.218–219 (§ 209); *ThLL* 1.1736.5 ff. Note the correct use in l. 80, *alium . . . virum*. Pronominal genitive forms in *-ius* are generally avoided in Augustan poetry, perhaps partly due to the uncertainty over their scansion. However, *alterius* can only be scanned with short *i* in dactylic poetry, and perhaps as a result it is the genitive pronoun form that is most frequently found: Verg. 6 times (*Aen.* 3); Hor. 6 (*Od.* 1); Tib. 0; Prop. 7; Ov. 30 (10 *Met.* + *Fasti*); in Lygdamus, again in 6.44 (once more at the start of a line). For scansion and statistics of genitive pronoun forms in *-ius*, see McKeown 370 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.14.14 *nullius*.

puella: for the elegiac sense of the term, see the commentary on Lygd. 2.1.

puella viri: for this combination at the end of a pentameter, cf. l. 52 above, *puella viro/*.

59: rupture of the *mutua cura*: Neaera gives no thought to the *coniugium* desired by Lygdamus, but to *discidium* or *divortium*. The manuscript tradition has *suas* instead of *tuis*. However, although most early editors (eg *edd. Aldinae 1502 et 1515*, Ach. Statius) as well as modern (from Heyne to Lenz-Galinsky) follow the traditional reading, nevertheless *suas* does not escape the suspicion of corruption to which any mere filler is exposed. In fact, the most recent editors (Herrmann, Luck, Lee, Tränkle), following a conjecture by Lipsius that was only accepted by Broukhusius and Vulpius among the earlier editors, choose to read *tuis* (*suis* [= *suorum curis*] Muretus, Dousa, Cartault, Pichard), a reading which has the advantage of rounding off the incomplete

sense of *diversas*. The combination of *diversus* with a dative can be found in poetry from Ov. *Her.* 18 (17).75; Hor. *Ep.* 1.18.5. The conjecture *diversoque suas* put forward by Gebhardus never enjoyed any degree of acceptance.

agitat mens: mental activity was referred to as *agitatio mentis* by Cicero (cf. *Off.* 1.17, *ad quod est adhibenda actio quaedam, non solum mentis agitatio*; 1.19) and Quintilian (cf. *Inst.* 1.1.1, *hominibus propria est mentis agitatio atque sollertia*); cf. also Varro *Lat.* 6.42, *actionum trium primus agitatus mentis*; Cic. *Div.* 2.128, *animus . . . agitatione et motu . . . vacuus*; *Nat. D.* 1.45, *anquirit . . . actionem mentis atque agitationem in deo*. For the use of *agitare* with *mens* as subject (personification), cf. Verg. *Aen.* 9.186–187, *aut pugnam aut aliquid iamdudum invadere magnum / mens agitat mihi, nec placida contenta quiete est*, the likely model for this passage (note the sympathetic dative *mihi*); cf. also Cic. *Fin.* 2.45, *mentem . . . multa simul agitantem*; Sen. *Med.* 47, *effera ignota horrida . . . mens intus agitat*; Sil. 13.399; Curt. 8.3.14; *ThLL* 1.336.65 ff. The personification of the mind as organ of thought and reflection dates back to Hom. *Od.* 16.73, θυμὸς ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μερμηρίζει.

agitat . . . curas: for the expression *agitare curas*, cf. Liv. 21.41.16, *nec domesticas solum agitet curas*; Sen. *Her. f.* 138, *labor exoritur durus et omnes agitat curas*. For the use of *agitare* in the sense of harbouring a certain mental condition, cf. Sall. *Cat.* 48.1, *gaudium atque laetitiam agitabat*; Ov. *Met.* 7.336, *nec spes agitatis inanes*; Tac. *Hist.* 1.19, *privatas spes agitantes*; *ThLL* 1.1335.80 ff.; in the sense of "considering, harbouring a particular thought", cf. Prop. 1.7.5, *nos, ut consuemus, nostros agitamus amores*.

diversas . . . curas: cf. Ter. *And.* 260, *tot me impediunt curae, quae meum animum divorsae trahunt*; cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 12.487, *diversaeque vocant animum in contraria curae*, though here the phrase has a different meaning.

mens impia: *impius* is the term applied to one who fails to carry out his moral obligations in some sphere of life (towards the gods, family, country, etc.); in the present context, Neaera fails in her 'conjugal' duties and obligations: *amor et fides*. On this, and for a better understanding of this line, cf. Lygd. 6.42, *ingrati referens impia facta viri*, where Lygdamus describes as "impious" the abandoning of Ariadne (= the poet) by her "ungrateful husband" Theseus (= Neaera). For *pius* in the sense of "faithful to one's conjugal obligations", cf. Prop. 3.13.18, *uxorum . . . pia turba* and 23–24, *hic genus infidum nuptarum, hic nulla puella / nec fida Evadne nec pia Penelope* (cf. also Pl. *Amph.* 1086; Ov. *Tr.* 1.2.37; *CIL* 6.10234.3, *mariti sui optimi piissimi*. For *impius* in

the 'sermo amatorius' («de iis, qui promissam amantibus fidem non servant» according to Pichon 171), cf. Prop. 2.9.19–20, *at tu non una potuisti nocte vacere, / impia, non unum sola manere diem!*; 17.13; Ov. *Met.* 14.736, *crudelis et impia* (sc. *Anaxarete*) (with Bömer 223); *Her.* 9.146, *impia, quid dubitas, Deianira, mori.*

For the phrase *impia mens*, cf. Catul. 67.25, *impia mens caeco flagrabat amore* (cf. also Cic. *Har.* 26, *impia mente*; Curt. 9.3.5, *impias mentes*); cf. also Ov. *Am.* 3.4.5, *et iam servaris bene corpus; adultera mens est.* The *editiones Romana 1475, Aldinae 1502* and *1515*, as well as Ach. Statius, read *mens anxia.*

60: the infinitive *esse* should be understood. For the construction *gaudere* + <*esse*> + perfect participle in the nominative, cf. Verg. *Ge.* 2.510, *gaudent perfusi sanguine fratrum* (ie *gaudent se perfusos esse*).

nupta domo: for the combination, cf. Prop. 2.3.54, (*Pero*) *mox Amythaonia nupta futura domo.*

nupta: the elegant use of the nominalized participle *nupta* to denote the wife (*uxor*), already attested in the archaic period (cf. Ter. *Ad.* 751, *nova nupta*), becomes more frequent in poetry from the Augustan period on; cf. Catul. 66.87; Hor. *Od.* 1.4.27; Prop. 3.13.23, *genus infidum nuptarum*; Ov. *Her.* 15.166; *Ars* 3.613, *nupta virum timeat*; *Rem.* 773; *Fasti* 2.794, *et venit in thalamos, nupta pudica, tuos*; Val.-Max. 9.1.ext.2; Val.-Flac. 4.362; *OLD* 1207 s.v.; Forcellini 4.323 s.v.; cf. also the elegiac use of the term in Pichon, p. 217. In Catullus *nupta* still preserves its proper original sense of *nova nupta* (cf. 61.96; 64.374, *dedatur nupta marito*). Ach. Statius conjectures *pulchra Neaera.*

casta . . . domo: a familiar phrase from Cic. *Cael.* 9; Catul. 64.384, generally in connection with the *pudica fides* of the married couple or the inhabitants of the house (cf. Verg. *Ge.* 2.524, *casta pudicitiam servat domus*; Hor. *Od.* 4.5.21, *nullius polluntur casta domus stupris*; Ov. *Met.* 7.724–725, *culpa domus ipsa carebat / castaque signa dabat*; Luc. *Civ.* 9.201); cf. also Prop. 2.6.28; Laus Pis. 120; Val.-Flac. 1.6; Sil. 15.101; Claud. *Carm. min.* 25.92; *ThLL* 5.1.1982.83–1983.2. Some authors, however, relate this *casta* to the *casto . . . poetae* of l. 43.

61–62: indignant complaint (σχετλιασμὸς) about the perfidy of the female sex (*perfidia muliebris*) and condemnation (*exsecratio*) of the treacherous woman, with which Phoebus closes his revelation of Neaera's act of betrayal. This misogynous topos of ancient literature can be traced back to the passionate complaint of Agamemnon in the *Odyssey* (11.427 and 456, οὐκέτι πιστὰ γυναιξίν). Among the Romans the *perfidia muliebris* was just as proverbial (cf. Pl. *Mil.* 456, *muliebri fecit fide*;

Prop. 2.9.31; 25.22; 3.13.23 *i.a.*; cf. Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 231 s.v. *mulier* 3) as the *perfidia Punica* (cf. Otto, *ibid.*, p. 291 s.v. *Punicus* 1 [1490]).

a . . .! / a . . .!: rhetorico-emotional repetition of *a!*. "Varios animi affectus exprimit, dolorem, luctum, aegritudinem, indignationem" (*ThLL* 1.1441.43–45); cf. Hofmann, *Latín familiar*, pp. 25 (§ 21): «amplia gama de impresiones cuya base común consiste en una fuerte descarga afectiva». The literary use of this interjection is predominantly poetic; in fact, in prose it is only attested in Varro *Men.* 361 and Cic. *Rep.* 1.59; *De or.* 2.285. It is characteristic of the *neoterici*: it appears 5 times in the long poems of Catullus (twice in c. 64: ll. 71 and 135). On *ah* and *a*, cf. Bömer 86 *ad* Ov. *Fasti* 2.45. In Lygdamus it reappears in 4.82 and 6.32 (comm.). As far as the Augustan elegiac poets are concerned, A. Kershaw ("Emendation and Usage: Two Readings of Propertius", *CQ* 75 [1980] 71–72; "A! and the elegist: more observations", *CPh* 78 [1983] 232–233), stresses how the use of this particle in these authors is subject to very strict patterns: of a total of 63 occurrences (Prop. 21; Tib. 3 + Lygd. 4 + [Tib.] 1; Ov. 34), on 58 occasions *a!* begins the line, generally forming one of the following five phrases: a) *a quotiens* or similar: 20 (Prop. 1.5.13; 18.21; 2.7.11; 16.4, *a . . . qualia*; 21.1, *a quantum*; 33.11; 3.15.13; Ov. *Am.* 2.19.11; 13; *Her.* 5.49; 9.79; 16.241; 243; 17.81; *Ars* 1.313; 2.567; 3.481; *Tr.* 1.3.51; 53); b) *a peream/as/at/ant*: 12 (Prop. 1.6.12; 11.30; 17.13; 2.23.12; 24.15; 32.27; Ov. *Ars* 2.272; 3.494; *Fasti* 4.240; 241; Lygd. 4.62); c) *a nimium*: 8 (Prop. 2.21.15; Ov. *Am.* 1.3.3; 3.9.4, *a nimis*; *Her.* 5.123; 11.43; 16.287; *Ponto* 1.8.71; *Fasti* 2.45); also Prop. 1.15.27, *audax a nimium*, a variant *metri causa*; d) *a pudet*: 4 (Ov. *Am.* 3.7.19; *Ars* 3.804; *Ponto* 4.1.6; 13.19); e) *a miser*: 4 (Tib. 1.9.3; 2.1.79, *a miseri*; Prop. 3.7.61; Ov. *Her.* 11.110); there are a further 9 examples where *a!* expresses cruelty (Prop. 1.20.32, *a dolor*; Tib. 1.10.59, *a lapis est*; Lygd. 4.61, *a crudele*; Ov. *Tr.* 2.77, *a ferus*) or else a wish (cf. Prop. 2.6.31, *a gemat*; 3.1.7, *a valeat*; Ov. *Fasti* 4.122 *a nolim*; in addition to the combination *a ego* in Lygd. 4.82 and [Tib.] 4.11.33). Of the 5 cases of *a!* within the line, 4 are with the formula *a demens* (Prop. 2.30.1; Ov. *Tr.* 5.10.51; *Ponto* 4.3.29; Lygd. 6.27 [comm.]); the other case, Prop. 1.15.27, *audax a nimium*, can be explained as a variant *metri causa* on the formula *a nimium* at the beginning of a line.

61 crudele genus: in the *sermo amatorius* the term *crudelis* is applied to anyone who commits an act of cruelty, making his or her lover suffer (*tormentum amoris*) and not taking pity on her/his pleas; cf. Catul. 64.136–137 (the words of Ariadne abandoned in Naxos), *nullane res*

potuit crudelis (scil. *Theseus*) *flectere mentis / consilium?*; Prop. 1.8.16, where Propertius calls Cynthia *crudelem* because she is leaving for Illyria with a rival; Ov. *Her.* 7.182, *in me* (scil. *Didonem*) *crudelis non potes* (scil. *Aeneas*) *esse diu*, where Aeneas is on the point of embarking for his destination across the seas. Note how, in these passages, the adjective *crudelis* is also applied to the loved one who brings about the *discidium*, as Neaera does here; cf. also Verg. *Ecl.* 2.6, *o crudelis Alexi!*; Bömer 559 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 3.442; on the elegiac sense of *crudelis*, cf. Pichon, p. 117. However, the elegiac poets' principal term to express cruelty is *saevus* (cf. Pichon, pp. 257–258). For the phraseology, cf. on the one hand Cic. *Inv.* 1.94, *mulierum genus avarum est*; on the other, Sen. *Phaed.* 564, *sola . . . Medea reddet feminas* ***dirum*** *genus.*

nec fidum femina nomen: the phrasing recalls Verg. *Aen.* 7.717, *quosque secans infaustum interluit Allia nomen.* In both places it is implied that the mere mention of the noun in apposition evokes the thought of a particular deed or person to which the adjective that is made to agree with *nomen* really refers. For *nomen* as the equivalent of *gens*, *genus*, *populus*; cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.201, *Romanum exstinguere nomen*; *Tr.* 2.221 (of Augustus), *non ea te moles Romani nominis urget.* For the litotes *nec fidum* (= *infidum*), cf. Prop. 3.13.24, *nec fida Evadne*, also in connection with an indignant protest about *perfidia muliebris.* For the combination *femina nomen*, cf. Ov. *Her.* 2.112, *regna . . . nomine femineo vix satis apta regi.*

femina: in poetry *femina* is clearly preferred to *mulier* from the Augustan period onwards, with the exception of Horace, in spite of being much less flexible for dactylic metre. The encomiastic connotations of *femina* as a term of respect as opposed to *mulier*, which is very often qualified pejoratively, made the word more suitable for poetry; *mulier*: Ov. 6 (*Am.* 1.10.29; *Ars* 3.95; 421; 523; 765; *Rem.* 659); Hor. 13 (*Od.* 1.37.32; 3.3.20; 7.13; 14.5; 24.18; *Epod.* 2.39; 12.1; 24; *Poet.* 4; *Sat.* 1.2.130; 2.5.70; 7.65; 90)); Verg. 1 (*Aen.* 7.661); Tib. 1 (2.2.2, *vir mulierque*); Prop. 5 (2.29.9; 3.8A.11; 11.49; 24.1; 4.6.65); cf. also [Verg.] *Cir.* 83; *femina*: Ov. 108 (44 *Met.* + *Fasti*); Verg. 10 (*Aen.* 9: 1.364; 4.95; 211; 570; 5.6; 6.448; 8.408; 11.505; 734; *Ge.* 3.216)); Hor. 4 (*Od.* 1.15.14; 4.1.29; 11.34; *Epod.* 9.12); Tib. 4 (1.2.35; 5.41; 10.54; 2.3.53); Prop. 17 (1.1.30; 2.1.55; 6.24; 9.4; 32; 2.13.10; 15.28; 17.20 [= 18.2]; 25.22; 25.48; 3.8A.10; 11.1; 30; 14.7; 15.9; 4.6.57; 8.55); cf. also [Verg.] *Cat.* 13.17; [Tib.] 3.19.1.

On the general question, see Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, pp. 53–57; J. N. Adams, "Latin Words for 'Woman' and 'Wife'", *Glotta* 50 (1972) 234–255; *ThLL* 8.1571.50 ff.

The use of *femina* here is explained by its emphatic sense of "female", in opposition to *mas* or *masculus*; cf. *ThLL* 6.1.458.9 ff. The pejorative tone comes from the context.

62 a pereat: a fairly frequent line-beginning in Propertius and Ovid. It is a habitual curse formula in the Augustan poets (cf. [Verg.] *Copa* 34; Tib. 1.1.51; 2.4.27; Prop. 1.6.12; 11.30; 17.13; 2.23.12; 24.15, *a, peream, si* . . .; 33.27; Ov. *Ars* 2.272; 3.494; *Fasti* 4.240–241; *Her.* 19[18].105, *a! potius peream* . . . [= Luc. *Civ.* 7.555]; *ThLL* 1.1442.66–74), who in turn are calquing an analogous expression from Greek poetry (cf. Hom. *Il.* 18.107, ὡς . . . ἀπόλοιτο; S. *El.* 126 ff. [= E. *Hipp.* 407], ὡς . . . ὄλοιτο; cf. W. S. Barrett, *Euripides. Hippolytos* [Oxford 1964] 234). On *pereat* as an elegiac formula to introduce *exsecrationes*, cf. Pichon, p. 231.

didicit fallere: for the expression, cf. Tib. 1.9.37, *non ego fallere doctus*; Ov. *Ponto* 3.3.53, *dic precor, ecquando didicisti fallere nuptas.*

didicit: indirect allusion to the *magisterium amoris* of a *lena.* On this sinister character and the materialist erotodidaxis she inculcated in the minds of her pupils, the elegiac women, cf. Tib. 1.5.47–58; 2.6.43–54; Prop. 4.5 and Ov. *Am.* 1.8; 3.5.40; cf. also the relevant chapter in Navarro, *Amada codiciosa*, pp. 41–57 (≈ *Habis* 22 [1991] 213–215). Undoubtedly the indirect allusion to the teaching of the *lena* suggests the role of Phoebus as *praeceptor amoris* as well as the *saevus Amor docuit.* For *didicit* in the context of the 'erotodidaxis' of feminine wiles, cf. Tib. 1.6.11–12, *fingere nunc* ***didicit*** *causas, ut sola cubaret, / cardine nunc tacito vertere posse fores*; Ov. *Ponto* 3.3.53 *sup. cit.*

For the result-focused, *novi*-type force of the perfect *didicit*, "I have learned" > "I know", cf. Tib. 1.9.65, *at tua* (scil. *uxor*) *perdidicit* (here, too, with negative emphasis); [Tib.] 3.7.17, *hinc et colla iugo didicit submittere taurus*; Ernout-Thomas 223 (§ 243); Hofmann-Szantyr 318 (§ 178 a).

fallere . . . virum: for the phrase, cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.310, *sive virum mavis fallere, falle viro*; 3.484, *est vobis vestros fallere cura viros*; *Tr.* 2.461–462, *docetque / qua nuptae possint fallere ab arte viros.*

fallere: on the elegiac use of this verb to denote the action of betraying the *fides* one has promised by committing adultery, cf. Pichon, pp. 141–142.

si qua: ie *quaecumque.*

63–75: after the revelation of Neaera's betrayal, and the subsequent curse on the *perfidia muliebris*, come words of encouragement and practical advice aimed at winning her back. The adversative particle

sed underlines this change of direction. Observe the concentric ring-like structure of the passage:

ll. 63–64: *preces*
  ll. 65–66: *servitium amoris*
    ll. 67–72: myth of Apollo and Admetus
  ll. 73–74: *servitium amoris*
ll. 75–76: *preces*

63: misogynous topos of the fickleness and mercurial nature of women. One source of inspiration for the misogynous musings of the present passage is undoubtedly Mercury's famous words to Aeneas in Verg. *Aen.* 4.569–570, *varium et* ***mutabile*** *semper femina*; cf. also *AL* 914.21 R, *femina natura varium et mutabile semper*; Sen. *Rem.* 16.3, *nihil est tam mobile quam feminarum voluntas, nihil tam vagum*; Calp. Sic. *Ecl.* 3.10, *mobilior ventis femina*; Capel. 5.485; cf. Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 231 s.v. *mulier* 2; *ThLL* 8.1715.52 ff. As for the subject of *flecti poterit*, it is Neaera as representative of the *crudele genus*. Ironically, Phoebus advises Lygdamus to take advantage of the positive side of the *mens mutabilis* of women. For the formulation of the 2nd half of the hexameter, cf. Ov. *Met.* 2.145–146, *si mutabile pectus est tibi, consiliis . . . utere nostris.*

sed flecti poterit: in elegiac poetry *flectere* is the action of breaking, with entreaty or threats (cf. Prop. 1.19.24, *flectitur assiduis certa puella minis*) or with gifts (cf. Prop. 1.8.39, *hanc ego non auro, non Indis flectere conchis, / sed potui blandi carminis obsequio*), the resistance of a scornful lover, who ends up giving in to the man; cf. Pichon, p. 150. Catul. 64.136–137 (words of Ariadne, abandoned in Naxos), *nullane res potuit crudelis* (scil. *Theseus*) *flectere mentis / consilium?*, is a more than likely inspiration behind the present passage of Lygdamus, as is shown by the linguistic echo *potuit crudelis flectere*, the protagonism of *mens* (cf. *mens impia*, l. 59) and the words of Lygdamus himself, when he expressly admits to having read this poem of Catullus (cf. 6.39–42). In view of this, surely l. 63 answers to the line of Catullus, inasmuch as nothing was able to sway Theseus, a man, from his decision in favour of *discidium*, whereas insistent entreaty is in fact capable of changing the mind of the unpredictable Neaera, who is, after all, a woman? In addition, the σχετλιασμός against the *perfidia muliebris* of the previous distich is simply a counterpoint to the σχετλιασμός of Ariadne, abandoned in Naxos, against the *perfidia et mobilitas virorum* (cf. Catul. 64.143–148).

mens mutabilis: for the expression, cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 4.76, *haec inconstantia mutabilitasque mentis.* The adjective *mutabilis* is known from Cicero on, but its use 'de animo humano' is first found in Verg. *Aen.* 4.569–570 (*sup. cit.*); cf. also Ov. *Her.* 7.51 (*Dido Aeneae*), *tu quoque cum ventis utinam mutabilis esses!*; *Met.* 2.145–146, *si mutabile pectus est tibi* (with Bömer 279); *Fasti* 4.601, *sed si forte tibi non est mutabile pectus*; *Tr.* 5.13.19.

illis: ie *mulieribus.* Possessive dative. Some early editors (*edd. princeps mai. 1472, Aldinae 1502 et 1515*, Muretus, Ach. Statius) read, with some mss., *illi* (= *Neaerae*), which is perfectly possible, but much less attractive than the asseveration concerning the female sex in general.

64: to make Neaera (or any woman) change her mind, it suffices to implore insistently. The stance recommended, that of stretching out the arms while beseeching, is the same one as mortals adopt when praying to the gods (cf. eg Call. *Del.* 107, πήχεις / ἀμφοτέρους ὀρέγουσα; Enn. *Ann.* 50, *manus ad caeli caerula templa tendebam lacrumans*; Catul. 66.10, *protendens bracchia*; Verg. *Aen.* 3.176–177, *tendoque supinas / ad caelum cum voce manus*) and the same position is adopted by the conquered when begging their conquerors for mercy (cf. eg Verg. *Aen.* 12.930–931, *ille* [scil. *Turnus*] *humilis supplexque oculos dextramque precantem / protendens*; Ov. *Met.* 5.175–176, *Perseus . . . bracchia tendentem* [scil. *Echemmontem*] . . . *confodit*; 214–215, *supplex / confessasque manus obliquaque bracchia tendens* [scil. *Phineus*]), or by any kind of suppliant in general (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.592, *supplexque manus ad litora tendit*). The clearest example of the transferal of this stance of the conquered to the field of love is Ov. *Her.* 4 (*Phaedra Hippolyto*) 153–154, *victa precor genibusque tuis regalia tendo / bracchia.* Cf. W. S. Anderson, "The Suppliant's Voice and Gesture in Vergil and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*" *ICS* 18 (1993) 165–177.

tu modo . . . tende: the construction *tu modo* + imperative or subjunctive, strictly for orders or exhortations (from Pl. *Aul.* 459, *abi tu modo*; 608, *tu modo cave quoiquam indicassis aurum meum esse istic, Fides*; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 4.8–10, */tu modo nascenti puero . . ./. . . ./ casta fave Lucina*; *Aen.* 2.160, */tu modo promissis maneas . . .*; 4.50, */tu modo posce deos veniam*; Prop. 2.15.49, */tu modo, dum lucet, fructum ne desere vitae*; Ov. *Am.* 2.13.26, *tu modo fac titulo muneribus locum*; *Met.* 8.488–490, */vos modo . . . /officium sentite meum*; 11.251–252, */tu modo . . . / . . . innecte*; 15.583–584, *tu modo rumpe moras portasque intrare patentes / adpropera!* (with Bömer 409); 15.659; Manil. 1.458; *OLD modo* 1b; *ThLL* 8.1300.19 ff.) is frequent in erotodidactic literature (cf. [Tib.] 3.10.16, */tu modo semper ama*; Ov. *Her.* 15 [*Sappho Phaoni*] 214, *tu modo solve ratem*; *Ars* 1.67, */tu modo*

Pompeia lentus spatiare sub umbra; 478, */tu modo blanditias fac legat usque tuas!*; *Rem.* 213–214, */tu* **tantum** . . . */ i procul et longas carpere perge vias!*), which in turn takes the construction from didactic literature proper, which it imitates and parodies; cf. Verg. *Ge.* 3.73–74, */tu modo, quos. . . . / praecipuum iam inde a teneris impende laborem* (with Mynors 192). See also Lygd. 6.9, *vos modo proposito dulces faveatis amici* (comm.). Note from the *loci similes* cited how *tu modo*, always at the beginning of a phrase, equally tends to open the line.

modo: ie *age* (Gr. ἄγε δή). The scanning of the final vowel of *modo* as short is an example of how a pronunciation that was normal in colloquial Latin from the archaic period has passed into the literary language. The Roman speaker tended to shorten the final vowel in iambic words (*correptio iambica*), no doubt because of the difficulty involved in pronouncing the first syllable with its due emphasis and immediately afterwards producing a long second syllable. This pronunciation *módŏ* soon became normal even in the literary language, where preserving the original scansion would have been felt to be pedantic (*modō* is still found in Plautus, Terence and Lucretius, but in Plautus *modŏ* also appears). For iambic shortening and its extension to non-iambic words, see Leumann 100–101 (§ 86); Kühner-Stegmann I.108 ff. (§ 15); Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, pp. 50 ff.; R. Hartenberger, *De 'o' finali apud poetas latinos*, Diss. Bonn 1911.

cum multa . . . prece: "with urgent entreaty". This is the elegiac motif of the *blandae querellae*, that is, the power of pleading in love; in addition to Lygd. 4.75–76, cf. Prop. 1.1.16, *tantum in amore preces . . . valent*; 6.11, *his ego non horam possum durare querellis*; 8.28, *vicimus:* ***assiduas*** *non tulit illa* (scil. *Cynthia*) *preces*; Ov. *Ars* 1.438, ***nec exiguas*** . . . *adde preces!* (on the *preces* of the lover to his *domina*, cf. Macleod, *CQ* 67 [1973] 294). The mss. diverge regarding the word that closes the pentameter. Although the vast majority give *fide*, a small number of them have *prece*. The opinions of modern editors and commentators are equally divided. However, *prece* seems to fit the context better (cf. Lygd. 3.2, *cum multa tura dedisse prece*; 4.76, *ergo ne dubita blandas adhibere querellas*; cf. the commentary on l. 64); *fide*, on the other hand, even in the sense of "promise, oath", or else "guarantee of fidelity, credibility" (cf. Prop. 1.18.18, *et non ulla meo clamant in ore fides*; with Fraenkel, *ThLL* 6.670.20; Vahlen, *Opusc.* I 357 n. 15; Fedeli, *Prop.* I 430, who defend the reading *fide* in Lygdamus) would be out of place in this passage: What need does Lygdamus have to promise fidelity to Cynthia when the betrayal has come from her?

To get round this difficulty W. Stroh, *Die römische Liebeselegie als werbende Dichtung* (Amsterdam 1971) 136, suggested for *cum multa . . . fide* the sense of *fidem saepius implorans*. Tränkle 128–129 also suggests that *cum multa . . . fide* is a brachylogical expression for "cum multa fidei imploratione"; but the mental acrobatics involved seem excessive. For the phrase *cum multa . . . prece*, apart from Lygd. 3.2, cf. Sen. *Med.* 845, *multa prece/*.

bracchia tende: for the expression, cf. Ov. *Met.* 5.215 (with Bömer 274–275); 419; 11.262; cf. also Catul. 66.10, *levia protendens bracchia*. The usual phrases to indicate entreaty are *manus tendere, porrigere* and similar, or *bracchia tendere, tollere* and similar; at times the two expressions are mixed (eg Ov. *Met.* 5.215, *confessasque manus obliquaque bracchia tendens*).

65–74: suffering is an intrinsic part of love. The theme of this passage is the elegiac motif of the *labores amoris* (frequently linked with the equally elegiac motif of the *militia amoris*) and that of the *servitium dominae* together. Phoebus illustrates this consideration by intercalating his own painful amatory experience (ll. 67–72). We thus observe a shift in the direction of his erotodidactic address, moving from the generic *ille* (ll. 65–66) to *ego* (ll. 67–72), and ending up with *tu* (ll. 73–74). The distichs which are the setting for the mythical legend take their inspiration from Virgil's *Eclogue* VIII, which Lygdamus deliberately imitates (cf. G. Lee, "The Date of Lygdamus and his Relationship to Ovid", *PCPhS* n. s. 5 [1958–59] 16); on the other hand, the treatment of the myth of Apollo and Admetus takes his inspiration from Tib. 2.3.11–28, although for the details the closest models seem to be Ov. *Ars* 2.239–241; *Met.* 2.680–685 and Sen. *Phaed.* 297–280, as will be seen in the commentary below.

65–66: the distich presents serious transmission problems, since the oldest mss. omit the hexameter and the *recentiores* give the most diverse readings, undoubtedly attributable to a humanist hand. Nevertheless, the reading of the *Fragmentum Cuiacianum*, *saevus Amor docuit validos temptare labores*, can be assumed to be close to the original. As regards the expression *saevus Amor docuit*, Lygdamus has in mind Verg. *Ecl.* 8.47–48, *saevus Amor docuit natorum sanguine matrem / conmaculare manus*, as well as its adaptation as an amatory motif in Prop. 1.1.5–6, *(Amor) me docuit castas odisse puellas improbus et nullo vivere consilio*, where it also serves as a poetic device to refer to the *servitium dominae* (see the discussion on this controversial passage in G. Luck, "Notes on

Propertius", *AJPh* 100 [1979] 73–75; Fedeli *Prop.* I 67–69). The striking oxymoron *saevus Amor* (ἄγριος ἔρως, cf. Pl. *Phd.* 81a), which Lygdamus borrows from Virgil, who uses it in connection with Medea, ultimately goes back to the famous opening lines of the *Medea* of Ennius: *Medea animo aegro amore saevo saucia* (*Scen.* 254). Ennius can be considered the inventor of the expression, given that the adjective *saevus* was not in the corresponding line of the *Medea* of Euripides which he is translating (ἔρωτι θυμὸν ἐκπλαγεῖσ' Ἰάσονος, l. 8). Virgil, however, is responsible for the personification of the expression, still used in connection with the cruelty of Medea, a context in which the adjective *saevus* is integrated better than in the present passage of Lygdamus, where the expected phrase would be *durus Amor* (cf. Verg. *Ge.* 3.259; *Aen.* 6.442). There is similar evidence of a less than skilful adaptation of the Virgilian model in *docuit*, which from being a simple aorist ("taught") with a specified singular direct object (*matrem*, ie *Medeam*) in Virgil, is transformed into a gnomic perfect ("teaches") with an understood, non-specific direct object ("people" or "those in love") in Lygdamus. Equally, *cogit* might be more to be expected.

M. Parca ("The Position of Lygdamus in Augustan Poetry", *Stud. in Lat. Lit. and Rom. Hist.* 4 [Bruxelles 1986] 472), working on the assumption that the tender pleas of l. 63 and the rustic song of Apollo as he carries out the demeaning task of tending Admetus' herds (ll. 67–72) have nothing to do with the *validos labores* and *verbera* of ll. 64–65, points to a possible Propertian source for this distich: the *exemplum* of Milanion-Atalanta in Prop. 1.1.9–16, where the hero conquers the maiden by dint of suffering and endurance, adding: "Lygdamus thus reduces the Milanion episode to an aphorism which he illustrates by means of another *exemplum*, suited to his own speaker" (*loc. cit.*); in fact, this idea can be supported by linguistic parallelisms between the two passages (*loc. cit.* n. 45): *labores* (Lygd. 4.65 and Prop. 1.1.9), *saevus* (Lygd. 4.65–66) and *saevitiam* (Prop. 1.1.10), and *verbera* (Lygd. 4.66) and *vulnere*, *saucius* (Prop. 1.1.13–14).

saevus Amor: to intensify the pathetic tone of the description of the power of Love, Lygdamus highlights the main characteristic of the behaviour of this god towards those in love, namely his cruelty, making use of one of the conventional epithets of Love in Augustine poetry. Probably lying behind the 'iunctura' *saevus Amor* (cf. Enn. *Scen.* 254; Verg. *Ecl.* 8.47; Tib. 1.6.3; Ov. *Am.* 1.1.5 [with McKeown 15; Ramírez de Verger-Socas 1 n. 2]; 6.34; 2.10.19; Sen. *Med.* 850; Claud. *Carm. min.* 29.51) and other similar 'iuncturae' (cf. eg *improbus Amor*

in Verg. *Ecl.* 8.49, *puer improbus ille*; *Aen.* 4.412, *improbe Amor*; Prop. 1.1.6 [with Fedeli I 69]; *ferus* ... *Amor* in Ov. *Am.* 1.2.8; 3.1.20; *Ars* 1.9; *durus Amor* in Verg. *Ge.* 3.259 [with Mynors 223]; *Aen.* 6.442 [with Norden 249]; *acer Amor* in Tib. 2.6.15 [with Smith 481; Murgatroyd 252]; [Tib.] 3.8.6; Prop. 2.30.9; Ov. *Her.* 4.70; *malus puer* in [Verg.] *Cir.* 133 [with Lyne 156]) are the Alexandrian epithets of Ἔρως in A. R. 3.297 and 1078, οὖλος Ἔρως, and 4.445, σχέτλι' Ἔρως, μέγα πῆμα; Eros is also described as σχέτλιος by Meleager (*AP* 5.57, Ἔρως, σχέτλι' ...), Simonides (*Poetae Melici Graeci* [ed. Page, Oxford 1962] 575) and Theognis 1231; as χαλεπός in Call. *Frg.* 75.49 Pf.; for δεινὸς ἔρως, cf. *AP* 5.176.1–2 (Mel.); Musae. 106; for ἄγριος Ἔρως, cf. *AP* 5.177.1 (Mel.); cf. also G. Giangrande, "Los tópicos helenísticos en la elegía latina", *Emerita* 42 (1974) 5. For analogous epithets applied in both Greek and Roman poetry to his mother Venus, cf. Nisbet-Hubbard 239 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 1.19.1, *mater saeva Cupidinum* (on the difficult and vindictive character of Venus, see Murgatroyd 263–264 *ad* Tib. 1.9.20 *aspera* ... *difficilisque Venus*). The gods of love were traditionally cruel (cf. *AP* 5.57; 178 [Mel.]; Tib. 1.6.2; 9.19–20; 2.4.4–5; 6.15) and showed no concern for love-struck mortals, even amusing themselves at their expense (cf. *AP* 5.176; 179 [Mel.]; Hor. *Od.* 1.33.10 ff.; Tib. 1.10.57–58, *at lascivus Amor rixae mala verba ministrat / inter et iratum lentus utrumque sedet*). The cruelty of Cupid can ultimately be traced back to Theoc. 3.15, νῦν ἔγνων τὸν Ἔρωτα· βαρὺς θεός. For an irate complaint about the cruel malice of this god towards those in love, see Ov. *Am.* 2.9.1 ff.

docuit: "induces". Fedeli *Prop.* I 67, apropos of Prop. 1.1.5, *(Amor) me docuit* ... *odisse*, stresses the peculiar sense of *docere* in this sort of context: "to induce someone to do something". Among the examples quoted in *ThLL* 5.1.1747.1 ff., Fedeli (*loc. cit.*) highlights especially Verg. *Ecl.* 8.47–48 (*sup. cit.*) and a Pompeian inscription mimicking the line of Propertius and Ov. *Am.* 3.11.35, *CIL* 4.1520 (= *CLE* 354 Bücheler), *candida me docuit nigras odisse puellas / odero, si potero, si non invitus amabo*. In connection with the "teachings" of Cupid, cf. also [Verg.] *Cir.* 135–136, *ille* (scil. *Amor*) *iram Poenos domitare leones / et validas* ***docuit*** *mansuescere tigris* (with Lyne 158). On this particular use of *docere*, cf. also A. Hus, *'Docere' et les mots de la famille de 'docere'. Étude de sémantique latine* (Paris 1965) 132.

65 validos temptare labores: the man in love must put up with everything for his beloved. This is the elegiac topos of the *labores amoris*, very close to (and at times encompassed by) the *militia amoris*;

there is a catalogue of these *labores amoris* in Pl. *Merc.* 858–863 (cf. N. Zagagi, "*Exilium amoris* in New Comedy", *Hermes* 116 [1988] 203–204 and n. 43 with Greek *loci*); Tib. 1.2.31–34; 4.41–52; Prop. 2.4.12–14 (with Ramírez de Verger 36); 23.7; 24B.25–29; Ov. *Ars* 2.235–250 (cf. *Rem.* 213 ff.); *Am.* 1.9.1–28; 2.16.19–32); for the elegiac motif of *militia amoris*, cf. A. Spies, *'Militat omnis amans': Ein Beitrag zur Bildersprache der antiken Erotik*, Diss. Tübingen 1930; E. Thomas, "Variations on a Military Theme in Ovid's *Amores*", *G & R* 11 (1964) 151–165; P. Murgatroyd, "*Militia amoris* and the Roman Elegists", *Latomus* 34 (1975) 59–79; R. J. Baker, "*Miles annosus*: the Military Motif in Propertius", *Latomus* 27 (1968) 322–349; J. A. Bellido, "El motivo literario de la *militia amoris* y su influencia en Ovid", *EClás* 31 (1989) 21–32.

The formulation recalls Verg. *Aen.* 6.437, *duros perferre labores* (cf. 8.291–293, *duros mille labores . . . pertulerit*); Tib. 1.4.47, *nec te paenitet duros subisse labores* (in a similar context of *obsequia amoris*); Ov. *Ars* 2.669, *dum vires annique sinunt, tolerate labores* (= *officia amoris*); cf. also Lucr. 3.999, *durum sufferre laborem*; [Verg.] *Cir.* 291, *duros passa labores* (with Lyne 222).

Certain difficulties are presented by the unusual combination *validos . . . labores*, which must mean that these are labours which require a great deal of physical energy and involve much hardship; for this use of the adjective *validus*, cf. Cels. 4.10.2, *prosunt frictiones validae*; Plin. *Nat.* 10.91, *franguntur ictu valido*; Apul. *Met.* 9.30, *nisu valido reducto . . . cardine*. The term *labores*, which in the Tibullan *locus* cited above (1.4.47) seems to refer to agricultural labours (*pace* Murgatroyd 147–148), may here suggest the twelve labours of Hercules (for *labores* in this sense, see *ThLL* 7.2.790.36–39; *OLD labor* 3b; Gr. ἆθλοι), Herculean undertakings with which the striking adjective *validos* fits very well. The idea being put forward is that love demands trials and suffering worthy of Hercules himself. On the *labores Herculis* (or *Herculei*) as a proverbial expression to refer to a difficult task, cf. Pl. *Persa* 1–2 (*aerumnas Herculi*); Cic. *Ac.* 2.108, *Herculi quendam laborem*; Catul. 55.13, *te iam ferre Herculei labos est* (with Fordyce 229); Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.38; 3.1.17 (with Laguna 197); in an amatory relationship, cf. Prop. 2.23.7–8, *deinde, ubi pertuleris, quos dicit fama, labores / Herculis, ut scribat: 'muneris ecquid habes?'*; 24B.34, *labor Alcidae*; cf. also Otto, *Sprichworter*, p. 162 (§ 800). Nor should it be forgotten that *labor* is one of the most significant and frequently-used words (no fewer than 73 times) in the *Aeneid*, where—no doubt because of the parallelism with Hercules—it

almost always describes the tribulations of Aeneas and «almost carries a connotation of hardship and sorrow. The noun is typically modified with adjectives like *durus* and *gravis*, and is frequently found as the object of verbs associated with pain, such as *fero* and its compounds, and also *molior*, *patior*, and *miseror* (S. Goins, "Two Aspects of Virgil's Use of *Labor* in the *Aeneid*", *CJ* 88 [1993] 375)». From Virgil on, then, *labor* is more than ever a synonym of "epic undertaking", with all its connotations of hardship and suffering.

Apart from this, the use of *labor* in connection with the suffering of love is already attested in comedy; cf. Pl. *Ps.* 695, *scis amorem, scis laborem*; Ter. *And.* 719, *verum ex eo nunc misera quem capit laborem*; cf. also Lucr. 4.1121, *adde quod absumunt vires pereuntque labore*; Catul. 50.14, *defessa labore membra*; on the elegiac use of the terms *labor* and *labores* to refer to the trials and torments of love, cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.11.6; *Ars* 2.236; *Her.* 17(16).75(73); Tib. 1.2.33; 4.47; Prop. 1.1.8; 2.23.7; 24.29; Fedeli 180–181 *ad* Prop. 1.6.23; Nisbet-Hubbard 224 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 1.17.19; Pichon, p. 180; for the Greek πόνος, cf. Ar. *Ec.* 975, διά τοι σὲ πόνους ἔχω; *Anacreont.* 33.13–16, εἰ τὸ κέντρον / πονεῖ τὸ τᾶς μελίττας, / τόσον δοκεῖς πονοῦσιν, / Ἔρως, ὅσους σὺ βάλλεις; for *temptare* in the sense of "to try to overcome" adverse circumstances or "to tackle" undertakings superior to one's strength, cf. Catul. 11.14; Lucr. 5.1299; Verg. *Ge.* 3.72; *Aen.* 5.499, where the aged Acestes faces the impossible task of competing in the archery contest with some young men; Hor. *Od.* 3.4.31, *insanientem navita Bosphorum temptabo*. In short, Lygdamus is ironically emphasizing the harshness of the *labores amoris* of the elegiac lover. For the term *labores* used to refer to the preoccupations and anguish brought on by love (*dolores animi*), cf. Lygd. 6.7 *dolores* (comm.).

The same phrase *temptare laborem/* at the end of a hexameter is found in Verg. *Aen.* 5.499; after Lucretius, where the inflected forms of *labor* always occupy the end of the hexameter (22 times: 1.141; 213; 2.2; 12; 730; 1160; 1163; 1165; 3.62; 366; 419; 943; 999; 4.958; 1121; 5.213; 869; 1182; 1214; 1272; 1359; 6.1244; the same occurs with the 10 instances of *laborare*: 1.849; 2.54; 2.970; 3.176; 507; 730; 733; 4.1099; 5.1430; 6.396), the oblique forms of *labor* tend to close the line (cf. Bömer 342 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.404 *hominumque labores/*).

66 verbera posse pati: the allusion to *verbera*, a punishment reserved for slaves (eg Ov. *Her.* 20.77), inevitably evokes the elegiac motif of the *servitium amoris* or «slavery of love», whereby the enamoured poet acts like a *servus* or «slave» to his beloved, the *domina*

or «mistress»; on this topos, cf. Tib. 1.1.55; 2.4.1–4; Prop. 1.4.1–4; 2.8.15; Ov. *Am.* 1.2.18; 3.5; 3.11.9–12; F. O. Copley, "*Servitium Amoris* in the Roman Elegists", *TAPhA* 78 (1947) 285–300; R. O. A. M. Lyne, "*Servitium Amoris*", *CQ* 29 (1979) 117–130; P. Murgatroyd, "*Servitium Amoris* and the Roman Elegists", *Latomus* 40 (1981) 589–606; A. Ramírez de Verger, "El amor como *servitium* en Tibulo", in F. Moya, *Simposio tibuliano*, Murcia 1985, pp. 371–377. For the servile torment of the lash in the context of *servitium amoris* (an innovation of Tibullus), cf. Tib. 1.6.37–38, *non saeva recurso / verbera*; 8.5–6 (with Murgatroyd 236–237); 9.22, *intorto verbere terga seca*; 2.3.80, *non ego me vinclis verberibusque nego*; Ov. *Ars* 2.533–534, *nec maledicta puta nec verbera ferre puellae / turpe*. For the *posse* + infinitive structure, cf. the commentary on Lygd. 3.31–32 and 4.48. For the *discere* + *posse* + infinitive structure, cf. Lygd. 6.43–44, *felix, quicumque dolore / alterius disces posse cavere tuo*. Since Broukhusius, some editors (eg Vulpius, Lachmann, Cartault) prefer the reading *verbera saeva* of the *Fragmentum Cuiacianum*; for this familiar phrase, cf. Ov. *Her.* 20.79, *famuli, cum verbera saeva verentur*, Tib. 1.6.37–38, cited above; Verg. *Ge.* 3.252; Ov. *Am.* 1.7.6, *saeva . . . in sanctos verbera ferre deos*; 13.18 (on the schoolboy punishment of the cane), *ut subeant tenerae verbera saeva manus*; *Her.* 20 (*Acontius Cydippae*).79, *verbera saeva verentur*, *Ibis* 159; *AL* 1175.6, *verbera nec niveo corpore saeva pati*; cf. also Ov. *Met.* 2.399, *verbere saevit*; [Sen.] *Oct.* 939, *exilium, verbera, saevas passa catenas*.

67–72: paradigmatic function of myth: the slavery which Apollo voluntarily underwent as drover in the palace of King Admetus **for love** of this mortal (*servitium amoris*) serves as an *exemplum* of the suffering demanded by *saevus Amor*. However, according to the traditional version of the myth, this servitude was not voluntary, but a punishment imposed by Zeus on Apollo for having slain the Cyclopes, forgers of the thunderbolt, with his bow, enraged because the father of the gods had struck down his son Aesculapius; cf. E. *Alc.* 1–14; Val.-Flac. 1.144 ff.; Stat. *Theb.* 6.375 ff.; Serv. *Aen.* 7.761; Serv. and [Prob.] *Ge.* 3.2; among the mythographers, cf. Apollod. 3.10.4 and *Epit.* 19.15; Hyg. *Fab.* 50. Lygdamus, however, follows the Hellenistic version of the myth, according to which Apollo served Admetus, not as a punishment from Zeus, but out of love; cf. Call. *Ap.* 47–49; Rhian. *Fr.* 10 Powell (= 265 [56] Jacoby); Plu. *Mor.* 761 e. This more romantic version might well have been followed by other Alexandrian poets like Hermesianax of Colophon, Alexander Aetolus and, above all, Phanocles, although we have no certain knowledge of this (cf.

A. Foulon, "Tibulle I.7 et Callimaque", *L'elégie romaine. Enracinement. Thèmes. Diffusion* [Paris 1980] 256).

In addition, the Hellenistic version of the myth was known in Rome at least from the time of Virgil, as can be deduced from a brief allusion in Verg. *Ge.* 3.1–2, *te memorande canemus / pastor ab Amphryso* (with Mynors 178). The shepherd from the Amphrysus is none other than Apollo, so called already by Callimachus (*Ap.* 47–49, ἐξότ' ἐπ' Ἀμφρυσσῷ ζευγίτιδας ἔτρεφεν ἵππους . . .); cf. W. Frentz, *Mitologisches in Vergils Georgica, Beiträge zur Klass. Philol.* 21, Meisenheim am Glan 1967, pp. 34–38. But the first elegiac precedent is Tib. 2.3.11–32, whose debt to the Hellenistic models was made clear some time ago by Muretus himself: "Sequitur autem Tibullus Rhiani veteris poetae et Callimachi μυθολογίαν, qui Apollinem sponte Admeto servisse tradunt, ipsius amore captum" (p. 92). Like Lygdamus, Tibullus too had already used the myth paradigmatically—the first to do so—as an *exemplum* of *officium et servitium amoris*, giving it a definitive erotic twist as an amatory motif (for these questions, as well as for the possible—anti-Augustan—political implications deriving from the special treatment of the myth in Tib. 2.3.11–32, see F. Moya del Baño, "Función del mito de Apolo y Admeto en Tibulo", *Myrtia* 1 (1986) 27–42: «La función de este mito en Tibulo no es otra que la de ejemplificar la postura antiaugústea del poeta, que pinta como a uno de elegíacos al dios que Augusto quería encumbrar [p. 27]»). However, in Tibullus the myth of Apollo the drover ('Apollo Nomios') is integrated better into the poem, tying in perfectly with Tibullus' readiness to take on harsh agricultural labour if only he can be with Nemesis, who is away in the country. And the fact is that between Tibullus and Lygdamus lies Ov. *Ars* 2.239–241:

Cynthius Admeti vaccas pavisse Pheraei
fertur et in perva delituisse casa:
Quod Phoebum decuit, quem non decet? exue fastus.

Ovid has completely dissociated the myth of Apollo and Admetus from the personal state of mind of the poet, objectivizing it as a universal *exemplum* of *officium amoris*: the connection between the beloved and the country which prompted Tibullus to allude to the country myth of Apollo disappears, as does the emphasis on the inconveniences of rural life, while greater stress is placed on the element of grave self-humiliation involved in the *servitium amoris* (cf. *exue fastus*, l. 241). Lygdamus limits himself to adding a few touches

of humour, such as making the god himself narrate the episode, and 'laying it on thick' about how humiliating it is for Apollo Citharoedus to be forced to play the shepherd's flute (!), an image perhaps taken from Ov. *Met.* 2.680–683:

> *Illud erat tempus, quo te (scil. Phoebum) pastoria pellis*
> *texit onusque fuit baculum silvestre sinistrae,*
> *alterius dispar septenis fistula cannis;*
> *dumque amor est curae, dum te tua fistula mulcet, . . .*

However, the closest model for the *lyra/avena* antithesis is undoubtedly Sen. *Phaed.* 296–298 (with Coffey-Mayer 119):

> *Thessali Phoebus pecoris magister*
> *egit armentum, positoque plectro*
> *impari tauros calamo vocavit.*

There are allusions to the myth of Apollo Nomios as an *exemplum* of *servitium amoris* in Ov. *Her.* 5.151–152, *ipse repertor opis vaccas pavisse Pheraeas / fertur et e nostro saucius igne fuit*; with emphasis on the insulting exchange of musical instruments as a clear proof of love in Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.58, *nec erubuit famulantis fistula Phoebi* (with Laguna 274 *ad* ll. 57–58); Plu. *Num.* 4.8; Nemes. *Ecl.* 2.70; Nonn. *D.* 10.321–325; Euseb. *Chr. Proem.* 1. I; in the Renaissance, the imitation by Fracastorius (*Carm.* 2.12) is worth noting.

There is a similar striking development in the myth of Hercules and Eurystheus; according to the traditional version, Hercules was forced by the oracle of the Pythian Apollo to place himself in the service of Eurystheus (cf. Apollod. 2.4.12); however, a variant adopted by the Hellenistic poet Diotimus presents Heracles as ἐραστής of Eurystheus (p. 213, *Fr.* 1 Kinkel). It is not by chance that both myths are invoked together as *exempla* of *servitium amoris* in some Latin poets (cf. Ov. *Ars* 2.221–222 [Hercules] and 239–240 [Apollo]; Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.57–58), although normally when Hercules is referred to as an example of *servus amoris*, the poets refer to his affair with Omphale (cf. Prop. 3.11.17–20; Ov. *Her.* 9.73–82; *Ars* 2.217–222; *Fasti* 2.305 ff.; Sen. *Phaed.* 296–298 [Apollo] and 317–324 [Hercules], with Mayor 120–121).

The myth of Apollo Nomios is one of many concerning love between a god and a mortal, such as Zeus and Ganymedes, Poseidon and Pelops, Dionysus and Adonis, among others, but especially the love between Hercules and Eurystheus (παιδικὸς ἔρως). It is by no means surprising that both Apollo and Hercules should be erotic

symbols, as J. S. Lasso de la Vega ("El amor dorio", in *El descubrimiento del amor en Grecia*, Madrid 1959, p. 65) notes that Apollo was the god in mythology most given to falling in love with ephebes, and as for the hero Heracles "it would be difficult—according to Plutarch, *Amatorius*, ch. 17 (= *Moralia* 761D)—to list his over-many loves".

On the myth, cf. Ruiz de Elvira, *Mitología clásica*, p. 225; on the erotic treatment and symbology of the myth, see G. Solimano, "Il mito di Apollo e Admeto negli elegiaci latini", *Mythos. Scr. in hon. M. Untersteiner* (Univ. di Genova 1970) 255–268; cf. also F. O. Copley, "*Servitium amoris* in the Roman Elegists", *TAPhA* 78 (1947) 286–288, 292–293; D. F. Bright, *Haec mihi fingebam. Tibullus in his World* (Leiden 1978) 194–197; A. Foulon, "Tibulle II.3 et l'alexandrinisme", *REL* 68 (1980) 252–283; P. Murgatroyd, "*Servitium amoris* and the Roman Elegist", *Latomus* 40 (1981) 598–599; R. Whitaker, *Myth and Personal Experience in Roman Love-Elegy* (Göttingen 1983) pp. 79–82; M. Parca, "The Position of Lygdamus in Augustan Poetry", *Stud. in Lat. Lit. and Rom. Hist.* 4 (Bruxelles 1986) 472. For Apollo as a pastoral god, see Williams 48 *ad* Call. *Ap.* 47, L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States* IV, Oxford 1907, p. 123 ff.; W. Furtwängler, "Apollon", in Roscher's *Lexicon* I, p. 432 ff.; K. Wernicke, "Apollon", *RE* II (1896) 10; F. Williams, "A Theophany in Theocritus", *CQ* 21 (1971) 141.

67: for the formulation of the line, cf. Tib. 2.3.11, *pavit et Admeti* ***tauros*** *formosus Apollo*; Ov. *Ars* 2.239–240, *Cynthius Admeti vaccas* ***pavisse*** *Pheraei / fertur.*

quondam: adverb of time frequently used in elegy to situate the mythological *exempla* used in remote times; cf. Tib. 1.1.19; 5.45; Prop. 1.2.17; 15.10; 2.6.15; 13B.53; 21.11; 32.57; 3.11.13; Ov. *Am.* 1.14.33; *Ars* 3.176; *Rem.* 47; *Tr.* 2.19; 5.5.3; *Ibis* 317; 327; 337; 345; 379; Lygd. 6.39. For the use of this and other temporal adverbs (eg *olim*) introducing longer mythological accounts, see Bühler *ad* Mosch. *Eur.* 1, Εὐρώπῃ **ποτὲ** Κύπρις ἐπὶ γλυκὺν ἧκεν ὄνειρον.

Admeti: on this king of Pherae, in Thessaly, cf. Grimal, *Mitología*, p. 7 s.v.; Ruiz de Elvira, *Mitología clásica*, p. 225.

niveas . . . iuvencas: for the expression *niveas . . . iuvencas*, cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.12.25–26, *nivea . . ./ . . . iuvenca*; 3.13.13, *niveae . . . iuvencae/*; in the masculine form in Verg. *Ecl.* 6.46, *nivei . . . iuvenci/* (gen.); *Ge.* 1.15, *nivei . . . iuvenci* (nom.); for the fluctuation in the sex of the animals in Apollo's charge, see the references cited in the notes to ll. 67–72: Apollo Nomios is commonly referred to as an oxherd (Euripides in *Alc.* 8 uses the verb ἐβουφόρβουν), but Tibullus in 2.3 mentions bulls

(l. 11), cows (l. 14a) and oxen (l. 20) indistinctly, Homer and Callimachus mares (Hom. *Il.* 2.763–767; Call. *Ap.* 48 [with Williams 49]), Pindar sheep (Pi. *P.* 9.64) and Ovid cows (*Her.* 5.151–152; *Ars* 2.339–340). This confusion may explain the reading *niveos . . . iuvencos* of some mss. According to Bömer (389 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.624 *iuvenca*) «wird in der hohen Sprache bevorzugt»; note the statistics for Ovid: *Met./Fasti* 18: elsewhere 11; cf. *ThLL* 7.2.731.22–36.

pavisse: rather poetic verb, for although attested throughout the Latin period from the *XII Tables* and Plautus, it is in fact rarely found in the historians: never in Sallust, Nepos, Velleius Paterculus or Celsus; nor is it used by Catullus.

68: negative allusion to the topos of *mendacia vatum* (cf. Bömer 403 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 13.732–734). For the phrasing of the line, cf. Ov. *Fasti* 3.738, *non habet ingratos fabula nostra iocos*; for the expression *fabula ficta*, "invented stories", cf. Cic. *Mil.* 8, *fictis fabulis* (= *De or.* 2.193); 42, *rumorem, fabulam falsam, fictam, levem perhorrescimus*; *Verr.* 3.182, *non me fugit, iudices, vetera exempla pro fictis fabulis iam audiri atque haberi*; *Fin.* 5.64, *non fictae solum fabulae, verum etiam historiae*; *Off.* 3.39, *fictam et commenticiam fabulam*; Phaedr. 1 pr. 7, *fictis iocari nos meminerit fabulis*. For the content of this line, cf. Tib. 2.3.31, *fabula nunc ille* (scil. *Apollo*) *est.*

iocum: cf. Ov. *Fasti* 6.320, *est multi fabula parva ioci*; 396; 3.695. For the sense of this term, which is close to that of *ludibrium*, "object of derision, laughing-stock", in connection with love (cf. Catul. 42.3; Hor. *Sat.* 2.5.37; Prop. 2.24.16, *si me fallaci dominae iam pudet esse iocum*; *Phaedr.* 1.21.2; Petr. *Satyr.* 57.5 *OLD iocus* 2). For the different meanings of this word in elegy, cf. Pichon, p. 175.

69 cithara . . . sonora: the adjective *sonorus*, first attested in Virgil's *Aeneid* (cf. 1.53; 12.139), is a learned variant on *canorus* or *sonans*. Applied to the lyre it is only found again in Stat. *Silv.* 1.5.4, *ferae . . . sonorae terga*. This infrequency explains the reading *canora* of some of the *recentiores*, probably a humanist emendation.

70: Apollo laments that at that time it was impossible for him to sing songs to the music of the lyre (cf. Tib. 2.3.12, *nec citharae intonsae profueruntve comae*). For the formulation, cf. Hor. *Poet.* 348–349, *nam neque chorda sonum reddit quem volt manus et mens, poscentique gravem persaepe remittit acutum*; for *canora*, cf. eg Verg. *Aen.* 9.504, *aere canoro* (= Ov. *Met.* 3.704); Ov. *Fasti* 3.849, *tubas . . . canoras.*

similes chordis: the adjective *similis* can take both the dative—its original construction—or the genitive, the latter construction becoming common from the meaning of "image, reflection" which it

assumed on being nominalized. In archaic Latin, the genitive prevails over the dative. In certain authors, however, both classical and post-classical, the dative gains ground. Cf. Kühner-Stegmann 2.1.431; Hofmann-Szantyr 78 (§ 59a) and 92 (§ 65); Ernout-Thomas 40 (§ 54) and 66 (§ 82); Bassols I.78 (§ 62.4).

reddere voce sonos: for the phrase, cf. Hor. *Od.* 4.11.34–35, *condisce modos, amanda voce quos reddas*; Ov. *Fasti* 6.426, (*Smintheus*) *hos non mentito reddidit ore sonos*; *CLE* 1109.14.

reddere: for the use of *reddere* in the sense of "to (re)produce sounds", cf. Hor. *Poet.* 158, *reddere qui voces iam scit puer*; Ov. *Ars* 3.295, *quaedam male reddere verba* (cf. Plin. 10.117, *humanas voces reddunt* [scil. *aves*]). On the harmony between the lyre and song, cf. Hor. *Od.* 4.9.4, *verba loquor socianda chordis.*

71: the source of inspiration for this line is undoubtedly Verg. *Ecl.* 1.2, *silvestrem tenui Musam meditaris avena/*. The combination *perlucenti . . . avena* has always raised serious problems of interpretation, as it is not clear what exactly is meant by the epithet *perlucens*. According to Postgate—who refers to passages like Pl. *Rud.* 102, *perlucet ea* (scil. *villa*) *quam cribrum crebrius*, and Juv. 11.13, *iam perlucente ruina*—the adjective is used to indicate that the reeds of the pipe had holes through which the light passed ("translucent stalk"). Némethy, for his part, takes *perlucens*, in its usual sense of "transparent", as an exaggeration of the idea of "fine, slender" which is usually associated with these reeds (cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 1.2, *tenui . . . avena*; E. *Or.* 146, λεπτοῦ δόνακος). More recently, J. Delz—"Apoll als verhinderter Sänger (zu [Tib.] 3.4.71)", *MH* 48 (1991) 61–62—, working from the ancient musical theory about the inferiority of wind instruments to string, since the former, unlike the latter, do not permit singing along with the instrument (cf. Arist. *Pol.* 8.6.5 [1341 a 24]; Plu. *Alc.* 2.6), proposed the emendation *praecludenti* (scil. *vocem*); for the phrase *vocem praecludere*, cf. Phaedr. 1.2.26 and Ov. *Met.* 2.658; *ThLL* 10.2.493.58 ff. Apollo Citharoedus is forced to play—the depth of humiliation—none other than the shepherd's pipe of his rival Marsyas, whom he defeated in a musical contest (cf. Diodor. 3.59.2–5).

For my part, I propose as the correct reading *permulcenti . . . avena*, an emendation which occurred to Huschke, according to Dissen 356 and De Golbéry 216, but was subsequently forgotten; cf. Ov. *Met.* 2.683, *dumque amor est curae, dum te tua fistula* ***mulcet***, a passage quoted above as source of inspiration for these lines. For the use of the compound *permulcere* in the sense of "to calm the passion of an

individual, to console him", cf. Cic. *Sen.* 4, *nulla consolatio permulcere posset stultam senectutem*; Verg. *Aen.* 5.816, *his ubi laeta deae permulsit pectora dictis.* Note, too, Ov. *Met.* 1.716, *languida permulcens medicata lumina virga*; *permulcere* belongs to elevated style; in Ovid, significantly, it is only found in *Met.* (1.716; 2.733; 4.599; 7.221) and *Fasti* (4.551); the simple form is more frequent (*Met.-Fasti* 17 / elsewhere 8). For the use of the simple form *mulcere* in connection with music or poetry, cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.11.22, *dum grato Danai puellas carmine mulces* (scil. *Orpheu*); Verg. *Aen.* 7.34, *volucres . . . aetherea mulcebant cantu*; Ov. *Met.* 10.301, *mea si vestras mulcebunt carmina mentes*; *Tr.* 4.1.12, *pastor harundineo carmine mulcet oves*; Sil. 12.220, *plectro mulcere labores*; 14.472, *septena . . . harundine . . . mulcebat* (scil. *Daphnis*) *silvas* (cf. also Ov. *Rem.* 197–198, *cum semel haec animum coepit mulcere voluptas, / debilibus pennis irritus exit Amor*). On the ability of the shepherd's flute to tame wild beasts, cf. Calp. *Sic.* 4.60–63, *truces haec fistula tauros / conciliat, nostroque sonat dulcissima Fauno. / Tityrus hanc habuit, cecinit qui primus in istis / montibus Hyblaea modulabile carmen avena.* I also gave some consideration to *praeludenti . . . avena*, given that first of all a tune was played with the syrinx and then the verse was sung (cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 8.25, *incipe Maenalios mecum, mea tibia, versus*), unlike the lyre, which permitted singing and playing at the same time, a difference which Lygdamus particularly wishes to stress here (ll. 69–71). The use of *praeludere*, "to play a prelude", in poetry is attested for the time of Lygdamus (cf. Stat. *Silv.* 1. pr.; *Ach.* 1.19).

meditabar: the use of *meditari* in the sense of *canere*, *recitare* ("to perform a song") is predominantly poetic and Virgilian; first in Verg. *Ecl.* 1.2, *silvestrem tenui Musam meditaris avena*; 6.8, *agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam*; 82, *omnia, quae Phoebo quondam meditante beatus audiit Eurotas*; cf. also [Verg.] *Lydia* 6, (*puella*) *mea summissa meditatur carmina voce*; Ov. *Ponto* 3.4.45; Apul. *Fl.* 17 p. 82, *olores . . . carmen senectae meditantur*; *ThLL* 8.579.75 ff.

72: Apollo was son of Zeus and Leto (Jupiter-Latona). The implication of this line is close to that of Ov. *Ars* 2.241, *quod Phoebum decuit, quem non decet? exue fastus.*

ille ego: *ille* is in apposition to *ego* with emphatic value ("I, the famed . . ."). *Ille* in combination with *ego*, *tu*, *hic*, apart from being a grandiloquent formula of introduction or self-identification (eg Ov. *Met.* 4.226–228 [*Sol*], *ille ego sum . . . qui longum metior annum, / omnia qui video, . . .*; 15.500 [with Bömer 387]; Mart. 9 *praef.* 5–6, *ille ego sum nulli nugarum laude secundus / quem non miraris, sed puto, lector, amas*), is above all a poetic device to emphasize what has occurred between a

person's "before" and "now", this contrast between the present and the past sometimes revealing a change of direction (in poetry, for instance), other times a loss of status, occasionally with humorous overtones derived from the emphatic use of *ille*; cf. eg [Verg.] *Aen.* 1.1a–1b, *ille ego qui quondam gracili modulatus avena / carmen*; *Cir.* 409–415 (with Munari [1944] 332; Lyne 272); Prop. 4.9.38, *ille ego sum: Alciden terra recepta vocat*; Ov. *Am.* 2.1.1–2, *hoc quoque composui . . . / ille ego nequitiae Naso poeta meae*; 3.8.23, *ille ego Musarum purus Phoebique sacerdos / ad rigidas canto carmen inane fores*; *Met.* 1.757–758, *ille ego liber, / ille ferox tacui!* (with Bömer 226–227); 15.500; *Tr.* 4.5.12, *'ille ego sum' cupere dicere posse palam* (with Luck 254); 10.1, *ille ego qui fuerim, tenerorum lusor amorum*; 5.7.55, *ille ego Romanus vates*; *Ponto* 1.2.33–34, *ille ego sum, lignum qui non admittar in ullum: / ille ego sum, frustra qui lapis esse velim*; *Ib.* 245, *ille ego sum vates*; Stat. *Silv.* 4.3.76–77, *in nunc ille ego turbidus minaxque / vix passus dubias prius carinas* (with Coleman 123); 5.5.38 ff.; *Theb.* 9.434–437 (address of the river-god Ismenus, polluted by the blood of his grandson Crenaeus), *ille ego clamatus sacris ululatibus amnis, / qui molles thyrsos Baccheaque cornua puro / fonte lavare feror, stipatus caedibus artas / in freta quaero vias*; Sil. 11.177 ff. On the parodic and humorous use of the formula *ille ego* to introduce the merits of the elegiac lover (*officia amoris*), cf. Tib. 1.5.10, *ille ego, cum tristi morbo defessa iaceres, / te dicor votis eripuisse meis* (with Smith 292–293); 6.31–32, *ille ego sum—nec me iam dicere vera pudebit— / instabat tota cui tua nocte canis*. On *ille* 'emphaticus', cf. Hofmann-Szantyr 185 (§ 105 c); Ernout-Thomas 188 (§ 213); Bassols I.201 (§ 191); *ThLL* 7.1.342.45 ff. On *ille ego* as a formula to introduce a lowering in status, cf. R. G. Austin, "Ille ego qui quondam . . .", *CQ* 18 (1968) 110. This phrase appears some 50 times in dactylic poetry (*ThLL* 5.2.275.78 ff.; 7.1.360.12 ff.)

Latonae filius: for the reference to Apollo as "son of Latona", cf. *Latonae puer* in Hor. *Od.* 4.6.37; *Latonia proles* in Ov. *Tr.* 5.1.57; *proles Latoia* in Ov. *Met.* 8.15; *stirps Letoïa* in Ov. *Tr.* 3.2.3; *Latonigena* in Ov. *Met.* 6.160; *Lato(i)us* in Hor. *Od.* 1.31.18; Ov. *Met.* 6.384; 11.196 (with Bömer 290); Fontenrose I 443; II 454. The expression, though first used in Horace, is not attested again until Ovid. For a similar expression applied to his sister Diana, as "daughter of Latona and Jupiter", cf. Catul. 34.5–6, *o Latonia, maximi / magna progenies Iovis.* For *Latonius* as an epithet of Apollo, see Lygd. 4.29 *Latonia Luna* (comm.).

Latonae: Latin name of the Greek goddess Leto; cf. Fiesel, *RE* 12.2148 ff.; Deecke, "Letois," in Roscher II, pp. 1981 ff.; Wissowa,

*RuK*², p. 295; Walde-Hofmann, *LEW* I, p. 771; Radke 173.

atque Iovis: of the 6 occasions on which Lygdamus uses *atque*, this is the only time he does so before a consonant, and therefore without elision of the second syllable (cf. 1.13; 22; 2.22; 28; 5.27). The same tendency can be observed in the Augustan poets (with the exception of Horace), as was noted by Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, pp. 83–85: for example, out of 35 examples of *atque* without elision (as against 294 with) in the *Aeneid*, 27 are in books VII–XII (cf. also Austin 59 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 4.128 *atque dolis*; 80 *ad* 6.127, *noctes atque dies*). The same can be said of the elegiac poets: of the mere 19 examples of *atque* without elision in the elegists, M. Platnauer (*Latin Elegiac Verse*, pp. 78–82) regards 4 as suspicious (Tib. 2.5.73; Prop. 3.13.39; Ov. *Am.* 1.13.19; *Tr.* 3.2.13); 11 offer different readings or admit of easy emendation (Prop. 2.26.8; Tib. 1.7.27–28; Ov. *Am.* 2.14.30; *Ars* 2.690; *Fasti* 3.363; *Tr.* 4.2.69; 4.85; 5.2.73–74; 13.34; *Ponto* 3.2.4; 9.60); only 4 present serious difficulties in the way of possible emendation: Tib. 2.2.8; Prop. 4.2.51–52; Ov. *Ars* 2.91; and Lygd. 4.72. To explain this apparently groundless aversion to prevocalic *atque*, Platnauer in another more detailed study on the question ("Elision of *Atque* in Roman Poetry", *CQ* 42 [1948] 91–93) concludes: «*atque*, which despite its five letters is of no more semantic use than the three-letter *-que* and of less than the two letters *et*, may have been felt by at any rate careful Latin poets to arrogate to itself more room than it was really worth. By means of elision they could (and so did) reduce the word to a size more in keeping with its semantic value». Perhaps Lygdamus' significant use of it reflects not only metrical considerations—in that it facilitates a trochee—but also the ceremonial tone which, according to Axelson (*ibidem*, p. 83), distinguished *atque* (and *ac*) from the other copulative particles (*et*, *-que*), a most appropriate tone for an allusion (not without a touch of humour) to the lofty lineage of Apollo. Note, too, that in contrast to the reluctance of the Augustan elegists to use an *atque* without elision in the 2nd half of the pentameter, a post-classical author like Martial displays no less than 8 examples of this "transgression" of classical metre (cf. Kay 144 *ad* Mart. 11.32.4 *atque calix/*), which in turn argues in favour of a late dating for the Lygdamus cycle.

73–74: for this distich Lygdamus once again has in mind *Eclogue* VIII of Virgil (cf. commentary on l. 65[66]). The formulation *nescis quid sit Amor* has as its obvious model Virgil's *nunc scio quid sit Amor* (l. 43), a reflection in turn of Theocr. 3.15, νῦν ἔγνων τὸν Ἔρωτα. More-

over, the *coniugium* of l. 74 recalls l. 18 of the Virgilian Eclogue, *coniugis indigno Nysae deceptus amore*: in both, the term denotes not marriage or the wife, but an amorous relationship with no conjugal bond (cf. G. Lee, "The Date of Lygdamus . . .", *PCPhS* 5 [1958–59] 16). This bucolic influence of Virgil may explain the phrase *dominam coniugiumque*, which is unusual in love elegy.

73 iuvenis: Lygdamus describes himself on a number of occasions as *iuvenis*, indirectly in 2.1–2, and again directly in 5.6 (comm.).

ferre recusas: for the expression, cf. Ov. *Ars* 2.655, *ferre novae nares taurorum terga recusant*; *Met.* 10.171, *non retia ferre recusat*; 14.486–487, *quid superest, quod iam patientia vestra recuset / ferre, viri?*. The structure of *recuso* with infinitive is attested in Latin from Cic. *Att.* 1.8.1; in non-negative clauses it is somewhat more frequent (usually with the infinitive *ferre*); rarer in prose (eg Cic. *Att.* 1.8.1; *Pis.* 57 (*te*) *recusantem bellum suscipere*; Plin. *Ep.* 4.17.11; 9.13.12), more frequent in poetry (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.126–127, *recusat / prodere voce sua quemquam aut opponere morti*; Hor. *Sat.* 2.5.17; 7.108; *Poet.* 39; Ov. *Met.* 1.385, *Pyrrha . . . iussis . . . deae parere recusat* [with Bömer 127]; cf. E. B. Lease, "Notes on Latin Syntax", *AJPh* 30 (1909) 307; Hofmann-Szantyr 347 (§ 191 D a).

recusas: for the elegiac use of this verb in connection with the *servitium dominae*, cf. Tib. 1.6.37–38, *non saeva recuso / verbera*, a passage also cited for l. 66. The verb is very frequent in Horace (10: *Ep.* 4; *Sat.* 6), Virgil (13: *Ecl.* 1 [3.29]; *Ge.* 6; *Aen.* 6) and Ovid (25: *Am.* 4; *Her.* 3 [3.115; 5.1a; 15.71]; *Ars* 1 [2.655]; *Met.* 9; *Fasti* 3; *Tr.* 3; *Ponto* 1), but used only exceptionally in Tibullus (1.6.37), and never in Propertius.

74: note the careful construction of this golden line (aABb), as well as the lofty solemnity conferred on it by the nasal alliteration ('m'). On the *versus aureus*, cf. Lygd. 3.5 (comm.).

immitem: ie *durus*, *saevus*, *inhumanus*; the application of this adjective to the heartless woman is familiar from the oxymoron of Hor. *Od.* 1.33.2, *immitis Glycerae*, "a harsh sweetness (γλυκερά)" (with Nisbet-Hubbard 371). The adjectives *immitis* and *ferus* are strictly applied to wild animals (cf. Sen. *Phaed.* 272–273, *meus iste labor est, aggredi iuvenem ferum, / mentemque saevam flectere immitis viri*). In their shift to the *sermo amatorius*, in which they describe the tyranny of the beloved (cf. eg Ov. *Met.* 13.804, [*Galatea*] *calcato immitior hydro*) some influence might have been exerted by the familiar phrase *immitis tyrannus* (eg Verg. *Ge.* 4.492 [scil. *Plutonis*]; [Verg.] *Cir.* 420; Paneg. 12[2].28.3).

According to *ThLL* 7.1.467.9–10, *immitis* is «vox praecipue poetica inde a Catullo... in prosa inde a Cic.». In fact, though extremely frequent in Ovid (23: *Am.* 1.6.17; *Her.* 3.133; *Met.* 14 [eg 5.92; 7.438; 8.66; 110; 10.573]; *Fasti* 1.625; *Tr.* 2.135; *Ponto* 3.2.71; *Ib.* 13; *Hal.* 23; 115; *Nux* 69), *immitis* is relatively exceptional in the *corpus* of the other Augustan poets: Hor. 3 (*Od.* 1.33.2; 2.5.10; *Poet.* 12); Prop. 2 (3.15.14; 4.11.13); Verg. 5 (*Aen.* 1.30; 3.87; *Ge.* 4.17; 492; *Cir.* 420); cf. Korn-Ehwald 9 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 8.110.

dominam: the use of the term *domina* to refer to the beloved belongs to poetic language, in particular the elegiac genre as an expression of the *servitium amoris* of the poet in love; cf. Catul. 68.68; 156; Tib. 1.1.46; 5.40; 2.3.5; 79; 4.1; 19; 25; 6.41; 47; Prop. 1.1.21; 3.17; 4.2; 7.6; etc.; in Lygdamus again in 6.14; cf. also I. Kapp, *ThLL* 5.1.1938.1–27; Pichon, p. 134. This poetic use is first attested in Lucil. *Frg.* 730 M.; cf. also *era* in Catul. 68.136. It is precisely in Catullus that the beloved first gains ascendancy over the poet-lover; Catullus portrays himself as completely servile and subordinate to Lesbia; cf. G. Lieberg, *Puella Divina. Die Gestalt der göttlichen Geliebten bei Catull im Zusammenhang der antiken Dichtung* (Amsterdam 1962) 179–184; V. A. Tracy, "The Poet-Lover in Augustan Elegy", *Latomus* 35 (1976) 577 n. 2. On the elegiac motif of *servitium amoris*, see the bibliography cited in the note on l. 66 *verbera posse pati*.

coniugium: on the use of this term to denote not matrimony but a love relationship aspiring to the stability of marriage, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.172, *nec iam furtivum Dido meditatur amorem: coniugium vocat.* There is therefore no need to take it *metonymice* as "wife", as many commentators would have it (eg Tränkle 131, who cites Prop. 4.11.87).

75–76: a return to l. 64; Neaera's will can be broken down by means of plaintive supplication. For the topos of the power of entreaty in love, see the commentary on l. 64 (*cum multa... prece*). Unlike this previous line, where the object is to stress the humiliation involved in the suppliant attitude of the lover, which is similar to that of the conquered, it is now the peculiar nature of the lover's entreaty that the poet wishes to highlight: it must be tender and plaintive, that is, it must flatter and rebuke at the same time. For the content and formulation of this distich, cf. Tib. 1.4.71–72, *blanditiis vult esse locum Venus ipsa: querellis / supplicibusque... favet*; Ov. *Met.* 3.375–376, *o quotiens voluit* (scil. *Echo ad Narcisum*) *blandis accedere dictis et molles adhibere preces.*

75: the initial particle *ergo* points to the logical conclusion represented by this line following the reasoning of the previous lines, while also

emphasizing the imperative: "now, then, . . .". For the expression *ergo ne dubita*, cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.343, *ergo age ne dubita cunctas sperare puellas!*. For the contrastive juxtaposition *molli/dura*, cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.1.22, *mollierunt duras lenia verba fores.*

ergo: for the poetic use and scansion of this particle, cf. Lygd. 2.9 (comm.).

ne dubita: the combination of *ne* with the present imperative is characteristic of colloquial language: in archaic Latin it is quite frequent in the comedy-writers (73 times in Pl., 13 in Ter.); in poetry it is found as an archaism from Catullus onwards (in 61.200, *ne remorare*; 62.59(60), *at tu ne pugna*; 67.18, *ne dubita*; see H. Heusch, *Das Archaische bei Catulls*, Diss. Bonn [1954] 155–156), although it is not very frequent in the Augustan period: Hor. 2 (*Od.* 1.28.23; *Sat.* 2.3.31–32); Verg. 30 (*Ecl.* 2.17; *Ge.* 1.501; *Aen.* 2.48; 606–607; 3.160; 316; 4.338; 6.74; 95; 196; 465; 544; 614; 698; 832; 868; 7.96; 202; 236; 438; 8.39; 532; 9.114; 10.11; 372; 11.401; 12.72; 565; 875; 938); Tib. 3 (1.1.67; 2.15; 9.17); Prop. 2 (2.15.49; 2.20.14); Ovid. 31 (20 *Met.* + *Fasti*; sólo 2 in *Am.* [1.7.63; 3.6.65]); in the tragedies of Seneca 12 times (with Tarrant 321 *ad* Sen. *Ag.* 976); very rare in prose (cf. Liv. 3.2.9, *ne timete*; Sen. *Contr.* 1.2.5, *ne metue*; Sen. *Dial.* 2.19.4, *ne repugnate*); cf. Serv. *Aen.* 6.544, *Terentius 'ne saevi tanto opere'* (= *Andr.* 868) *et antique dictum est, nam nunc 'ne saevias' dicimus*; Norden 271 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 6.554; Bömer 266 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.101; Barratt 160–161 *ad* Luc. *Civ.* 5.492; Kühner-Stegmann I, pp. 202–203; Hofmann-Szantyr 340 (§ 187 d), together with the review by F. Bömer, *Gymnasium* 73 (1966) 333. For the expression *ne dubita*, cf. Catul. 67.18; Verg. *Aen.* 3.316; Prop. 2.20.14, *tu modo ne dubita de gravitate mea!*; Ov. *Am.* 1.7.63, *at tu ne dubita*; *Ars* 1.343 (*sup. cit.*); 2.211, *nec dubita*; *Met.* 2.101; 5.335; 9.698; *Fasti* 3.641; 699; Calp. 3.75, *accipe, ne dubites.* As regards the poetic use of *dubitare*, as McKeown rightly observes (195 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.7.63), it is particularly striking that this verb is much more frequent in Ovid than in the other Augustan poets: Ov. 97 times (46 *Met.* + *Fasti*; 3 *Am.* [1.7.63; 11.5; 3.14.36]); Verg. 10 (*Ge.* 3: 2.29; 433; 4.242; *Aen.* 7: 3.170; 316; 6.806; 7.311; 8.614; 9.12; 191); Hor. 2 (*Od.* 1.12.35; *Ep.* 2.1.80); Tib. 1 (1.2.85); Prop. 1 (2.20.14).

blandas . . . querellas: for the phrase, cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.9.17–18, *mollium . . . querellarum*, "effeminate lamentation", (with n. by Nisbet-Hubbard 148); Stat. *Silv.* 2.1.45, *blandis . . . querellis*; Auson. 418.65 Peiper (= t. II p. 118.3 v Evelyn-White; 284.65 Prete); cf. Fletcher 49. The term *querellae* is only found in love elegy in the *Corp. Tib.*

where it takes on a similar meaning to *preces* (cf. Tib. 1.2.9, *ianua . . . victa querelis*; 4.71–72, *querelis supplicibus*; 8.53, *maestas . . . querellas*; cf. Pichon, p. 248). There is therefore nothing surprising about the combination *blandas . . . querellas*, undoubtedly based on the familiar *blandae preces* (cf. n. *ad* Lygd. 4.76 *molli prece*). On *blandus* in the sense of 'ad capiendos animos aptus', cf. Catul. 64.139, *at non haec quondam blanda promissa dedisti voce mihi*; the commentary on Lygd. 3.2 and 6.46; and the 'loci similes' in Pichon, p. 94. *Blandus* recalls the *blanditiae* with which lovers try to conquer their beloved, mixing them with promises and entreaties; cf. Ov. *Met.* 14.18–19 (Glaucus to Circe on Scylla), *pudor est promissa precesque / blanditiasque meas contempta verba referre* (with Bömer 14).

76: *sententia.* Note the studied arrangement of the nouns and adjectives (aBbA), as well as the antithesis between the adjectives (*molli/dura*).

vincuntur: the elegiac use of this military term in connection with love was possible from Verg. *Ecl.* 10.69, *omnia vincit Amor*; cf. Murgatroyd, "*Militia Amoris* and the Roman Elegist", *Latomus* 34 (1975) 62 n. 11.; for the elegiac sense of *vincere*, 'amorem alicuius impetrare', cf. Pichon, p. 294. Curiously, *vincere* and *mollis* are again used together by Lygdamus in 6.16 for the same image of softening hearts, though in this instance in connection with Amor himself: *Armeniasque tigres et fulvas ille leaenas / vicit et indomitis mollia corda dedit* (cf. also Hor. *Epod.* 5.14, *mollire . . . pectora*).

molli . . . prece: hypallage for *preces quae pectora mollire possunt* ("tender" > "making tender"). For the expression, cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.2.66, *quid precibus nostris mollius esse potest*, and in particular Ov. *Met.* 3.376, *molles adhibere preces* (cited by Fletcher 49); *ThLL* 8.1376.58–60; cf. also the phrases *blandae preces* (eg Hor. *Poet.* 395; Ov. *Her.* 3.30; *Ars* 1.710; *Met.* 10.642; [Albinov.] *Liv.* 424; Sen. *Her. f.* 1014; *ThLL* 2.2039.10–11) and *mollia verba* (eg Hor. *Epod.* 5.83–84; Ov. *Am.* 1.12.22; *Ponto* 3.6.14; Sen. *Dial.* 3.6.3; *Nat.* 2.49.3; *ThLL* 8.1376.54–58).

pectora dura: for the phrase, cf. Ov. *Met.* 14.693; Liv. 10.31.11; cf. also 'e contrario' Stat. *Theb.* 5.166, *pectore molli.* The metaphoric use of *pectora* to refer to the mind or spirit of a person is frequent in the 'sermo poeticus' (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 8.151, *sunt nobis fortia bello pectora*; in connection with amorous sentiment, cf. Lygd. 1.20; 4.84; for more 'loci' see Pichon, p. 229). For the elegiac sense of *durus*, see the commentary on Lygd. 2.3.

77–80: final words of the god in which, after appealing to the trustworthiness of his oracles, Phoebus requests that the poet should trans-

mit a prophetic message to Neaera from the deity, namely: Apollo prophesies that she will marry Lygdamus; she must therefore be content and feel fortunate to have such a man for her husband, and cease her search for another.

77: appeal to the trustworthiness of oracles, as a preparatory formula for the oracle which he is about to pronounce. The formulation is defective, since there is no express indication of the prophetic divinity—presumably *mea* or *nostra*—who will vouchsafe the oracles. On the reliability of oracles, cf. Ov. *Ponto* 3.1.131, *non semper sacras reddunt oracula sortis.*

quod si: "and if...", "but if...". The neuter accusative of the relative pronoun (*quod*) in relation to a conditional (or temporal, or causal) clause loses its relative force completely and becomes equivalent to a conjunction, being used as a mere linking particle. Sometimes, as in the present case, it carries a slight adversative force which imposes a change of direction on the current thought and introduces a new topic, in the manner of *sed* or *at*; cf. Kühner-Stegmann II.2.320; Hofmann-Szantyr 571 (§ 308 g ß); Ernout-Thomas 439 (§ 423); Bassols II.254–255 (§ 245). Axelson (*Unpoetische Wörter*, pp. 47–48), refutes the traditional concept of this particle as prosaic and colloquial, since elevated poetry shows no aversion to *quodsi*: 5 times in the *Aeneid*, 8 in the *Metamorphoses* (cf. Bömer 315 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.293; 287 *ad* 7.350), 8 in Lucan; cf. also Williams, *Trad. & Orig.*, pp. 760 ("*quod si* is always so used by Virgil in speeches: it... produces a contrast which is accompanied by a change in the speaking voice") and 775. Although it is true that this particle is rare in certain poets, the same also occurs in prose, where *quodsi* is very much favoured by Cicero, but is attested only sporadically in Sallust and Livy. As regards the elegiac genre, this introductory expression is fairly frequent in Propertius (no fewer than 21 times; eg 3.14.33; with tmesis in 2.1.17, *quod mihi si*; 2.15.37; cf. E. Neumann, *De cottidiani sermonis apud Propertium proprietatibus*, Diss. Königsberg 1925, p. 48), and is also found in Tibullus (1.3.53; 2.6.7), Pseudo-Tibullus (3.7.201; 11.11) and in Ovid the elegist (*Rem.* 245 *quod nisi*; *Tr.* 1.4.17; *Ponto* 1.7.41; 4.8.69).

vera canunt: for *canere* in the sense of *vaticinare*, cf. Cic. *Catil.* 3.18; Hor. *Saec.* 25, *vosque veraces cecinisse, Parcae*; Verg. *Aen.* 8.49, *haud incerta cano*; Tib. 1.7.1, *hunc cecinere diem Parcae*; Prop. 3.4.9, *omina fausta cano*; Ov. *Her.* 21.234, *a Delphis fata canente deo*; *Met.* 12.455, *cecinisse futura* (the same phrase in Sen. *Med.* 656; *Nat.* 2.34.2; *CLE* 1141.16; Ennod. *Dict.* 2.5; *CSEL* 6 p. 432.1); Luc. *Civ.* 1.566; 9.577; [Albinov.]

Liv. 247, *sic cecinere deae* (*Parcae*); Serv. *Aen.* 8.656, *canebat: quasi praedivinabat, nam 'canere' et dicere et divinare significat*; *ThLL* 3.271.12 ff. The use of *cano* with the neuter accusative of an adjective referring to the degree of veracity of prophecies is perfectly classical, first in Hor. *Sat.* 2.5.58, *ludis me obscura canendo*, and Verg. *Aen.* 8.49, *haud incerta cano* (cf. *ThLL* 3.272.5–17); the phrase *vera canere* from Tib. 2.5.63, *vera cano* (cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.30; 3.790; Val.-Flac. 2.218; Sil. 10.47; Capit. *Macr.* 3.1); for *falsa canere*, cf. Luc. *Civ.* 5.151; for *vana canere*, cf. Prop. 3.6.31; Stat. *Theb.* 3.646; Dracont. *Romul.* 8.152. For the formulation, cf. also Lygd. 4.5 *vera monent* (comm.).

78: introductory formula for the prophetic message.

illi: scil. *Neaerae.*

nostro nomine: "in my name, on my behalf". This expression is not poetic; cf. Suet. *Tib.* 6.1, *cum patris nomine . . . epistulas ipse dictaret*; Tac. *Hist.* 1.5, *neque dari donativum sub nomine Galbae promissum.*

dicta: in contrast with the generic *verba*, *dicta* takes on the specific meaning of "promise, word given"; on this point, cf. Catul. 64.148, (scil. *viri*) *dicta nihil metuere, nihil periuria curant* (clearly corresponding chiastically to l. 146, *nil metuunt iurare, nihil promittere parcunt*); Verg. *Aen.* 8.643, *at tu dictis, Albane, maneres*; 10.246, *mea si non irrita dicta putaris*; Ov. *Fasti* 6.55, *dicta fides sequitur*; *Tr.* 3.3.62; *CLE* 250.14 (a. 156), *mea dicta* (ie *vota*) / *resolvo*; *ThLL* 5.1.993.1 ff. The term *dicta* is sometimes also applied to the prophetic words or replies of the *oracula Phoebi*, inasmuch as they are considered promises of the god; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.114–115, *suspensi Eurypilum scitatum oracula Phoebi / mittimus, isque adytis haec tristia dicta reportat*; Sil. 9.62, *firmabis nostro Phoebeae dicta Sibyllae* (cf. 13.501); for *dicta* in connection with the *vaticinia deorum* in general, cf. also Ov. *Fasti* 5.626, *talia fatidici dicta fuisse Iovis* '. . . *mittite'*. The word is not found in Tibullus; in Catullus and Lucretius only in the plural (never *dictum*).

refer: *vox propria* for the action of "transmitting" words; cf. *OLD refero* 5a.

79–80: *oraculum Phoebi* which Lygdamus is to transmit word for word to Neaera.

79 hoc . . . coniugium: ie 'cum Lygdamo coniugium'; *hoc* is ablative, as in l. 80.

tibi: scil. *Neaerae.*

promittit: "prophesies to you". On the consideration of the oracles of Apollo as promises of the god, see the commentary on l. 78 (*dicta*). For the use of the verb *promittere* in connection with the *oracula Phoebi*,

cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.7.28–29, *certus enim promisit Apollo / ambiguam tellure nova Salamina futuram.*

Delius: scil. *Phoebus.* This epithet is given to Apollo—as that of *Delia* is to his sister Diana from Verg. *Ecl.* 7.29 (cf. *loci* in *ThLL Onom.* 3.90.8–16)—because of his having been born on the Aegean island of Delos; cf. Macr. *Sat.* 1.17.32; Maltby, *LALE*, p. 180; see comm. on l. 50 *Cynthius.* Although it is attested as an adjective from the end of the republican period (cf. Cic. *Verr.* 1.47, *Apollinem . . . Delium*; Verg. *Aen.* 3.162, *Delius . . . Apollo*; 6.12, *Delius . . . vates* [ie *Phoebus*]; Hor. *Od.* 3.4.64, *Delius . . . Apollo*), its substantivized use ("the Delian") is more recent, first found in Ovid (6 times: *Met.* 1.454; 5.329; 6.250; 11.174; 12.598; 13.650); cf. also Lygd. 6.8 (comm.); Petr. *Satyr.* 89. l. 4, *Delio profante*; Val.-Flac. 1.446; Stat. *Theb.* 1.628; 7.750; *Ach.* 1.487; Arn. 4.22; 6.12; Optat.-Porph. *Carm.* 3.17; Serv. *Aen.* 3.85; Claud. *Pros.* 2.136; Aus. 305.4 Peiper, *iubenti Delio* (= 146.166 Prete; t. I p. 322.23 v Evelyn-White); 413.13 Peiper (= 269.13 Prete; t. II p. 90.18 v Evelyn-White); several times in Marcianus Capella and Sidonius Apollinaris; Fontenrose I 443; II 454; *ThLL Onom.* 3.89.75–90.4

ipse: 'emphaticus' ("he himself and no other", "he in person"). Perhaps the idea is that the oracle is "sung" straight out of Apollo's own mouth, with no need for any Pythoness: 'sponte sua', with no consultant of any kind being previously required.

80 felix hoc: the textual problem involved in the manuscript tradition (*felix ac alium*) was solved by Muretus (*felix hoc alium*; likewise Scaliger ex F). However, the text as thus restored raises serious problems of interpretation deriving from the punctuation. Does *hoc* depend on *felix* or *alium*? Muretus took it together with *alium* as an ablative of comparison depending on an adjective carrying an idea of differentiation (*hoc alium* = *alium quam hunc*); for this undoubtedly colloquial expression, cf. Varro *Rust.* 3.16.23; Cic. *Ep.* 11.2.2; Hor. *Ep.* 1.16.20, *neve putes alium sapiente bonoque beatum*; 2.1.240, *alius Lysippo*; *Sat.* 2.3.208, *species alias veris*; Phaedr. 3 pr. 41, *quod si accusator alius Seiano foret*; frequent too in Sen. *Ep.* and Apul. *Met.*; cf. also Kühner-Stegmann II.2.467; Hofmann-Szantyr 110–111 (§ 75 *Zus.* b); Ernout-Thomas 174 (§ 202); Bassols I.127. However, this use is neither elegiac nor classical. Modern editors, following Broukhusius, prefer to interpret the *hoc* as dependent on *felix* (*felix hoc* = *felix hoc coniugio* vel *coniuge*); cf. Ov. *Ponto* 4.11.22, *coniugio felix iam potes esse novo*; *Met.* 6.681, *coniuge felix*; 9.333, (*Andraemon*) *habetur coniuge* (scil. *Dryope*) *felix*; 10.422,

o, dixit, felicem coniuge matrem; 11.266, *felix et nato, felix et coniuge Peleus* (with Bömer 308); 15.482, *coniuge qui* (sc. *Numa*) *felix nympha ducibusque Camenis* (with Bömer 382); for *felix* with the ablative, cf. also Hor. *Sat.* 1.6.52–53, *felicem dicere non hoc / me possim, casu quod te sortitus amicum*; *ThLL* 6.445.15 (*felix* + ablative of person). A third, very attractive possibility is to follow Müller and Tescari in taking *felix hoc* with the hexameter in enjambement: "this marriage is promised to you by the Delian in person / as a happy one: forbear from loving another man"; the use of *felix* with reference to favourable oracles and prophecies upholds this hypothesis; however, the close parallelism between ll. 60 (*nec gaudet casta nupta Neaera domo*) and 80 makes it advisable to consider *felix* (≈ *gaudeat*) as referring to Neaera. The variant on this last proposal, *ipse / felix: ecce alium* (Baehrens), has found no favour whatsoever.

alium . . . virum: the rival; cf. Lygd. 58 *alterius . . . viri* (comm.).

desine velle: for the expression, cf. Catul. 73.1; Verg. *Ge.* 4.448, *sed tu desine velle*; Ov. *Am.* 1.10.64; Sen. *Ben.* 6.21.4; *Ep.* 49.2; 61.1; 81.26; Sil. 11.348; also Lygd. 4.4, *desinite . . . quaerere velle*.

The construction *desine* + infinitive is (together with *parce* + infinitive) one of the most widely used prohibition formulas in poetry. It developed from the model *noli* + infinitive, the expression more frequently used by prose-writers, and is representative of the general tendency of Latin-speakers to avoid the use of the imperative in prohibitions; cf. Kühner-Stegmann II.1.202; Hoffmann-Szantyr 337 (§ 186 III); Ernout-Thomas 232–233 (§ 251); Bassols I.362–363 (§ 362). For other expressions of prohibition in poetry (with *parce, fuge, mitte*), see the commentary on Lygd. 5.6, *parce nocere*.

velle: the use of the verb *volo* in the sense of "to desire a person" is not frequent in literary Latin. Note, however, the sexual connotations in Ov. *Am.* 2.19(20).1–2, *si tibi non opus est servata, stulte, puella, / at mihi fac serves, quo magis ipse* ***velim***; 3.4.6; *Ars* 1.110; 3.586 (cf. Pichon, p. 288). Cf. also Lucil. 559, *aurum vis hominemne?*; Mart. 6.40.4, *tempora quid faciunt! hanc volo, te volui.*

81: transitional line. When Apollo finishes speaking, Lygdamus awakens. There is a similar sequence in Ov. *Met.* 15.663–664, *extemplo cum voce deus, cum voce deoque / somnus abit.*

/dixit et: a frequent formula in epic to mark the end of a god's speech (*dixit*), followed by his rapid and unexpected disappearance (the copulative *et* underlines the swift transition between the two consecutive actions); for its position at the beginning of a line, cf.

Bömer 228 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 1.762; cf. eg Ov. *Met.* 11.783. In addition, the use of *dixi* is frequent in comedy to stress the end of an intervention (cf. Pl. *Aul.* 682; Ter. *Hec.* 612; Don. *ad* Ter. *Phorm.* 437, *'dixi' solent dicere peracta causa*) and it would seem that orators used to deliver a *dixi* to bring their speeches to a dramatic conclusion (Gr. εἴρηκα; cf. Arist. *Rh.* III cap. 19 extr.); cf. Cic. *Verr.* 1.56 (Schol. p. 152 Or.); Apul. *Apol.* 103; F. Marx 106 *ad* Lucil. 282 (= 287 Krenkel; 7.12 Charpin); *ThLL* 5.1.969.40 ff.

ignavus defluxit corpore somnus: convoluted variant of the expression *somnus abit* which Ovid uses with great frequency to introduce the image of sleep abandoning the body (never in the other Augustan poets); cf. Ov. *Met.* 7.643; 9.472; 15.664; *Fasti* 3.23; 6.389; *ThLL* 1.70.38 «saepissime».

ignavus . . . somnus: the phrase, according to *ThLL* 7.1 281.14–15), is only attested in Ov. *Met.* 11.593, *ignavi domus . . . Somni/* (in the same position in the hexameter), the likely model for Lygdamus (cf. comm. on l. 55); cf. also Auson. 157.23 (*soporum*). The adjective *ignavus* (= *piger*), in the whole of the *Corp. Tib.* only found in Lygdamus (cf. also Lygd. 3.38), acquires in connection with *defluxit* a predicative value that is absolutely equivalent to *sensim atque sensim*, although there is nothing to prevent it from being interpreted as a true epithet of *somnus* in the sense of *languorem addens*, as in the passage of Ovid cited above and Ov. *Met.* 2.763; 7.529.

defluxit: for the use of *defluere* in the sense of *evanescere*, see the commentary on Lygd. 1.18, *nullus defluat inde color.*

corpore: Broukhusius reads *pectore* instead of the traditional *corpore*, and cites Verg. *Aen.* 4.530; 9.326, *toto proflabat pectore somnum*; Ov. *Her.* 18.27, *mulcentem pectora somnum.*

82: "oh that I might never (come to) see such misfortune!". For the formulation, cf. on the one hand Tib. 2.4.7, *o ego ne possim tales sentire dolores* (though here as an unfulfillable desire referring to the present), and on the other Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.68, *mala tanta videnti*; [Verg.] *Cir.* 455, *sit satis hoc, tantum solam vidisse malorum.* A few editors (Broukhusius, Vulpius, Baehrens) prefer to read *non possum* for *ne possim*, in accordance with some mss., among them the authoritative *codex Guelferbytanus.*

a, ¦ ego: hiatus (or non-elision of a free final vowel or else one followed by—*m* before an initial vowel) is found quite frequently in the elegiac poets after the interjections *o*, *heu* and *a*; cf. Tib. 2.3.5, *o ¦ ego, cum aspicerem . . .*; 4.7, *o ¦ ego ne possim . . .*; [Tib.] 3.17.3, *a ¦ ego non aliter . . .*; Prop. 2.33.31, *tuque, o ¦ Eurytion . . .*; 4.9.2; Ov. *Am.* 2.5.7,

o ¦ *utinam arguerem* . . .; 9.2; 3.1.16; *Ars* 3.347; *Fasti* 5.465, *heu,* ¦ *ubi Mars pater est?*; Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, p. 57.

a: for the spelling, its poetic tone and its predominantly formulaic use in the Augustan elegists, see Lygd. 4.61–62 (comm.).

videre: Fedeli *Prop.* I 75 expresses scepticism regarding the example cited by Lachmann *Prop.* 4–5 for *videre* with the senses of *adire* (eg Verg. *Ge.* 2.502, *insanumque forum aut populi tabularia vidi*) and *experiri* (quoting the passage of Lygdamus). On the other hand, Kiessling-Heinze 35 *ad* Hor *Sat.* 1.2.68 (**mala tanta videnti**) notes: «videre ansehen müssen, fast soviel wie *pati*» (= Lejay 50). Lyne (287–288 *ad* [Verg.] *Cir.* 455, *sit satis hoc, tantum solam vidisse malorum*) adds Ter. *Ad.* 867, *duxi uxorem: quam ibi miseriam vidi*; Verg. *Ge.* 2.68, *casus abies visura marinos*; [Verg.] *Cir.* 247–248, *indigna laborum / milia visuram.*

83–84: incredulity of Lygdamus (*nec crediderim*) with regard to the revelation of Neaera's perfidy. In the hexameter an infinitive *esse* should be understood, forming a possessive dative construction with *tibi. Votis contraria vota*, formally moulded on Verg. *Aen.* 1.239, *fatis contraria fata* (cf. also Ov. *Met.* 14.301, *verba dicuntur dictis contraria verbis*), refers back to l. 59: the inclinations of Neaera run in a contrary direction to those of the poet. Fedeli *Prop.* I 158 sees an allusion here on the part of Lygdamus to Prop. 1.5.9, *quod si* (*puella*) *forte tuis non est contraria votis/*.

83 crediderim: potential subjunctive with present meaning. The perfect subjunctive as potential seems to have been quite rare in archaic Latin. Cicero extended its use slightly, using more persons: the 1st person plural and the 2nd singular appear for the first time in this author. Then its use spreads, perhaps under the influence of the Greek aorist (cf. Barratt 201 *ad* Luc. *Civ.* 5.610). It was always rare with deponents and passives. See Kühner-Stegmann I, pp. 176 ff.

In the opinion of Axelson ("Lygd. & Ovid", pp. 104–105) this *crediderim* is an echo of the passage of Ovid which served as inspiration to Lygdamus for ll. 83–91: *Fasti* 4.7.11–20, where Ovid says that he would sooner believe (*credam*, l. 11) in the existence of mythological monsters (*adynata*) than think that his friend, who has not written, has forgotten him. Lygdamus has transformed the Ovidian incredulity topos into one of insensitivity. The presence of the Chimaera, Scylla and Cerberus in the catalogue of mythological monsters of both authors seems to lend weight to this hypothesis, *pace* Büchner ("Lygdamus", p. 504), who derives the Lygdamean catalogue directly from Catul. 64.154–156, a possible influence which, moreover, is not ruled out by Axelson (p. 105); cf. comm. on ll. 85–94.

For the construction *crediderim* + accusative + infinitive, cf. Verg. *Ge.* 2.338; Hor. *Od.* 2.13.5; Prop. 1.1.23; Ov. *Ars* 3.178, *crediderim nymphas hac ego veste tegi*; *Met.* 15.259–260 (with Bömer 324); from Liv. 1.55.8, also frequent in prose; *ThLL* 4.1147.37 ff.

votis . . . vota: polyptoton; cf. Lausberg, *Retórica literaria*, pp. 118–124 (§§ 640–648). *Votum* in the sense of *cupiditas amatoria* ("amorous desire") is a very common term in erotic poetry (cf. Pichon, p. 300).

84 crimen: legal term often applied in elegy to acts of adultery or betrayal; cf. Pichon, p. 116.

pectore inesse tuo: the fairly infrequent use of *inesse* with an ablative and no preposition can also be found in two very similar passages of Lucretius: 1.590, *maculas generalis corpore inesse*; 3.634–635, *toto sentimus corpore inesse / vitalem sensum* (both cited by Fletcher 49). Broukhusius, for his part, solved the problem by adopting the dative form *pectori* of some mss.; this also preserves the parallelism with the *tibi* of the previous hexameter; cf. also Sen. *Dial.* 3.5.3, *pectori ineese.* For *inesse* + (*in*) *animo* or similar, cf. *ThLL* 7.1.2047.50 ff. *Inesse* is not a word belonging to elevated language: once in Verg.; Hor. 3 times (only *Sat.*); Tib. once (1.6.34); Prop. once; Ov. 43: *Met.* 3 (7.678 [with Bömer 369]; 9.688; 10.616); *Fasti* 13; elsewhere 27; Lygd. 2 (4.84; 6.49).

pectore: "mind, spirit". See the commentary on l. 76.

85–94: a long period—5 complete distichs introduced by the particle *nam*—in which Lygdamus tries to argue the reasons for his incredulity concerning the news of Neaera's treachery: her illustrious birth and the amiable nature of her parents make such a cruel and insensitive act as treachery quite unimaginable in their daughter. However, as was made clear by Race (*Classical Priamel*, p. 133 n. 37), the form of expression chosen by the poet to underline his trust in Neaera is the priamel: as counterpoint to the good background and pleasant disposition of Neaera's parents, Lygdamus previously develops, in six different items, the well-known topos of "insensitivity", but in negated form.

The topos of 'insensitivity', in its variant that consists in highlighting the "harshness" of an individual through the device of symbolically attributing to him non-human forebears (geographical accidents, wild beasts, mythological monsters), ultimately goes back to Hom. *Il.* 16.33–35, where Patroclus reproaches the spiteful Achilles for being insensitive to the pleas of the Greeks in a terrible predicament, and calls him "son" of the raging sea or steep rocks:

νηλεές, οὐκ ἄρα σοί γε πατὴρ ἦν ἱππότα Πηλεύς,
οὐδὲ Θέτις μήτηρ· γλαυκὴ δέ σε τίκτε θάλασσα
πέτραι τ' ἠλίβατοι, ὅτι τοι νόος ἐστὶν ἀπηνής.

Cf. also Hom. *Od.* 19.163, οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ δρυός ἐσσι παλαιφάτου οὐδε ἀπὸ πέτρης. For the commonplace "born from stone", cf. Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 322 s.v. *silex* 2 (1647).

After Homer, this variant on the topos is only found in classical Greek literature in the *Bacchae* of Euripides. There the chorus of Maenads respond to the question of who fathered Pentheus (ll. 988–991):

τίς ἄρα νιν ἔτεκεν;
οὐ γὰρ ἐξ αἵματος
γυναικῶν ἔφυ, λεαίνας δέ τινος
ὅδ' ἢ Γοργόνων Λιβυσσᾶν γένος.

It was Catullus who introduced it into Roman literature. Note two passages; 60.1–3 (with Fordyce 234):

Num te leaena montibus Libystinis
aut Scylla latrans infima inguinum parte
tam mente dura ***procreavit*** *ac taetra, . . .?*

and 64.154–157 (Ariadne to Theseus):

Quaenam te ***genuit*** *sola sub rupe leaena,*
quod mare ***conceptum*** *spumantibus* ***expuit*** *undis,*
quae Syrtis, quae Scylla rapax, quae vasta Charybdis,
talia qui reddis pro dulci praemia vita?

To the Homeric symbols of insensitivity, the stormy sea and the steep rocks, Catullus adds the lioness and Scylla, undoubtedly taken from the other classical Greek model cited, Euripides: the lioness appears in *Ba.* 990, and the conjoint allusion to the lioness and Scylla as terms of comparison in a topos of cruelty, though not in the genetic context, in *Med.* 1341–1343 (Jason to Medea, who has killed the common children of both), σέ . . ./ λέαιναν, οὐ γυναῖκα, τῆς Τυρσηνίδος / Σκύλλης ἔχουσαν ἀγριωτέραν φύσιν (words picked up again by Medea in ll. 1358–1359). In this way Catullus introduces into the topos, which was originally based on accidents of nature, non-human living beings, that is, wild beasts and mythological monsters.

But the main innovation in Catullus with respect to the classical Greek authors mentioned is the reutilization of the topos as an erotic motif, that is, its application to one insensitive in love. Undoubtedly the neoteric Catullus took his inspiration here from Hellenistic models

which are for the most part lost today but to whose likely existence there is testimony in Theoc. 3, where the topos is applied to the god of love himself (ll. 15–16):

> νῦν ἔγνων τὸν Ἔρωτα· βαρὺς θεός· ἦ ῥα λεαίνας
> μαζὸν ἐθήλαζεν, δρυμῷ τέ νιν ἔτραφε μάτηρ,

Also [Theoc.] 23 (Ἐραστής), whose anonymous author transfers with full erotic sense Theocritus' forceful image of the insensitivity acquired during a child's early years (strictly, not conception; ἀνατρέφω: "to nurse, bring up") to a *durus puer* (ll. 19–20):

> «Ἄγριε παῖ καὶ στυγνέ, **κακᾶς ἀνάθρεμμα λεαίνας**,
> λάινε παῖ καὶ ἔρωτος ἀνάξιε, . . .» (cf. l. 10)

After the introduction of the topos by Catullus, it gained great popularity among Roman authors, so much so that even Virgil made use of it in *Ecl.* 8.43–45 (a passage clearly inspired by Theocritus):

> *Nunc scio quid sit Amor: duris in cotibus illum*
> *aut Tmaros aut Rhodope aut extremi Garamantes*
> *nec generis nostri puerum nec sanguinis edunt.*

and also in *Aen.* 4.365–367 (Dido to Aeneas):

> *Nec tibi diva parens generis nec Dardanus auctor,*
> *perfide, sed duris genuit te cautibus horrens*
> *Caucasus Hyrcanaeque admorunt ubera tigres.*

Each of these passages of Virgil is noticeably influenced by the Greek model of its genre: the first by the passage of Theocritus cited (the upbringing of Eros), and the words of Dido by those of Patroclus in Homer's *Odyssey*.

The Theocritean variant of the wild animal as wet-nurse enjoys continuity after Virgil in several passages of Ovid *infra cit.* (*Met.* 9.615; *Tr.* 1.8.43–44 [with Luck 73]; 3.11.3; *Ibis* 229–331) and in Hieron. *Ep.* 66.1.2, *quae enim . . . de silice excisa praecordia et Hyrcanarum tigrium lacte nutrita possunt sine lacrimis . . . audire nomen . . .?* Perhaps, though in a very attenuated form, also in Lygd. 4.90 (*tulit* 'lato sensu' = "brought up").

In contrast to Catullus, Virgil in the *Aeneid* picks up the Homeric form of the topos: human parents (–) / non-human parents (+); that is, in opposition to the Catullan scheme *belua te genuerunt*, the more explicit *non parentes, sed belua te genuerunt.* However, Virgil cannot ignore the post-Homeric evolution of the topos: from Catullus (and

Euripides) come the symbols of insensitivity taken from the animal world, as well as the precise geographical references; on the other hand, the image of suckling (l. 367) is Hellenistic. It is true, however, that Virgil finds no room in his lines for mythological monsters, as first Euripides and then Catullus had done.

Horace, too, in his *Odes* has left us a significant sample of the topos of insensitivity. It is a curious variant on the negated form (*Od.* 3.10.11–12):

Non te Penelopen difficilem procis
Tyrrhenus genuit parens.

With Ovid the topos flourishes noticeably, although he virtually exhausts the motif, combining and integrating the different models and influences; cf. Ov. *Her.* 7 (*Dido Aeneae*) 37–39, *te lapis et montes innataque rupibus altis / robora, te saevae progenuere ferae, / aut mare, quale vides agitari nunc quoque ventis*; 10 (*Ariadna Theseo*) 131–132, *nec pater est Aegeus, nec tu Pittheidos Aethrae / filius; auctores saxa fretumque tui*; *Met.* 7.32–33, *hoc ego si patiar, tum me de tigride natam / tum ferrum et scopulos gestare in corde fatebor*, 9.613–615, *neque enim est de tigride natus / nec rigidas silices solidumve in pectore ferrum / aut adamanta gerit nec lac bibit ille leaenae*; *Tr.* 1.8.37–44, *non ego te genitum placida reor urbe Quirini, / . . . / sed scopulis, Ponti quos haec habet ora Sinistri, / inque feris Scythiae Sarmaticis iugis: / et tua sunt silicis circum praecordia venae, / et rigidum ferri semina pectus habet: / quaeque tibi quondam tenero ducenda palato / plena dedit nutrix ubera, tigris erat*; 3.11.3–4, *natus es e scopulis et pastus lacte ferino / et dicam silices pectus habere tuum*; *Ibis* 229–332, *guttura que imbuerunt infantia lacte canino: / hic primus pueri venit in ora cibus. / perbibit inde suae rabiem nutricis alumnus, / latrat et in toto verba canina foro.* But undoubtedly the passage of Ovid that is closest to Lygdamus is *Met.* 8.120–125a:

non genetrix Europa tibi est, sed inhospita Syrtis,
Armeniae tigres Austroque agitata Charibdis.
Nec Iove tu natus, nec mater imagine tauri
ducta tua est: generis falsa est ea fabula; verus
et ferus et captus nullius amore iuvencae,
qui te progenuit, taurus fuit . . .

Here Ovid picks up the Catullan combination of mythological monsters, fierce animals and fearsome geographical accidents to symbolize extreme insensitivity, as Lygdamus was to do later. After Ovid, cf. also Sen. *Herc. O.* 143–146.

It is on the Homeric-Virgilian form of the topos, human parents

(–) / non-human parents (+) that Lygdamus moulds his lines, although he endows them with just the opposite sense: *non saeva belua, sed amabiles parentes te genuerunt* (non-human parents [–] / human parents [+]), since he cannot believe that Neaera is capable of committing the cruel act of abandoning him for another man. On the other hand, in the catalogue of monsters, which he extravagantly extends to seven, Lygdamus makes use of Catullus' catalogue in epyllion 64, a poem that is very much in his mind in the whole of this cycle of poems. From Catullus he borrows the raging sea (l. 86), Scylla (l. 89), the lioness (l. 90) and the Syrtes (l. 91b). However, Lygdamus makes no mention of Charybdis, which is in his Catullan model (the three monstruous geographical accidents also appear together in Verg. *Aen.* 7.302–303, *quid Syrtes aut Scylla mihi, quid vasta Charybdis / profuit?*), but he does introduce the mention of Scythia (l. 91a; previously in Ov. *Tr.* 1.8.40) and two new mythological monsters, Chimaera and Cerberus, unprecedented in connection with this topos, but whose presence is justified by that of Scylla. In fact, these three fabulous creatures had already been mentioned together in the catalogue of mythological monsters in Ov. *Tr.* 4.7.11–18, although in a completely different context. Note also that Horace in *Od.* 1.27 (with Nisbet-Hubbard 315–317, who cite 'loci similes') had already called a *dura et rapax puella* Charybdis (l. 19) and Chimaera (ll. 23–24). As for the negative form in which the topos is developed here, there is nothing strange in it, bearing in mind that the other hyperbolic expression to describe a person's cruelty or insensitivity, that is, to rebuke him for having a heart of iron or stone (from Hom. *Il.* 24.205, σιδήρειόν νυ τοι ἦτορ; 22.357; *Od.* 23.172; cf. Murgatroyd 66–67 *ad* Tib. 1.1.63–64; Nisbet-Hubbard 48–49 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 1.3.9; McKeown 313–314 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.11.9–10; Luck 74–75 *ad* Ov. *Tr.* 1.8.41–42; A. Hermann, "Das steinharte Herz: zur Geschichte einer Metapher", *JbAC* 4 [1961] 77–107; Otto, *Sprichwörter*, pp. 4, 134, 322; Lygd. 2.2 *ferreus* [comm.]; 3 *durus* [comm.]), also appears in negated form (cf. Tib. 1.1.63–64, *flebis; non tua sunt duro praecordia ferro / vincta nec in tenera stat tibi corde silex*). Certain passages of Ovid in which the two formulas are mixed (cf. Ov. *Met.* 9.613–615; 14.711–713; *Tr.* 1.8.37–44; 3.11.3–4) might lie behind the contamination of this negative form.

On the evolution of the topos, see O. Weinreich, "Catull c. 80", *Hermes* 87 (1959) 75–90; on the Hellenistic precedents, G. Lieberg, "Catull 60 und Ps.Theokrit 23", *Hermes* 94 (1966) 115–119.

85: the image of the raging sea as a symbol of cruelty and fierceness

dates back to Hom. *Il.* 16.34 (*sup. cit.*). Before Lygdamus, it had already been used by Ovid in *Met.* 14.711, *saevior illa freto surgente cadentibus Haedis* (= mid-December, the stormy season), precisely in connection with other symbols of harshness, stone and iron (ll. 712–713). Contrast, moreover, the static image of the sea in Lygdamus with the dynamism of the raging sea in his model, Catul. 64.156, *quod mare conceptum spumantibus expuit undis*, and also the greater rawness of *expuit* as compared with the neutral *genuerunt*.

It should also be borne in mind that the use of the sea as a proverbial term for "cruelty" fitted in well with the negative and fearful image the Romans always had of it: the adjectives *truculentus* (eg Catul. 63.16 [with Fordyce 265]; 64.179) and *trux* (eg Catul. 4.9; Hor. *Od.* 1.3.10; [Verg.] *Cir.* 76 [with Lyne 136]) which habitually accompany its mere mention in poetry reflect this atavistic Roman feeling of attachment to the land, as befitted their pastoral and rural origins.

nam: in Lygdamus, always occupying initial position in its phrase (cf. 3.11; 22; 4.36 [*namque*]), except in Lygd. 4.43 (comm.).

aequora ponti: hexameter-ending characteristic of elevated poetry from Lucr. 1.8, *tibi rident aequora ponti/* (cf. also Lucr. 2.772; 781, *in aequore ponti/*; 6.440; 628, *ex aequore ponti/*; 6.440, *ad aequora ponti*; Verg. *Ge.* 1.469; *Aen.* 6.729, ... *sub aequore pontus/*; 10.103, *premit placida aequora pontus/*; *ThLL* 1.1023.84 ff.), to whom is also due the poetic denomination of the sea as a "plain". Ovid, however, only uses this clichéd line-ending in Ov. *Met.* 2.872, *per aequora ponti* (with Bömer 440, who observes: «*ThLL* 1.1024.1: 'Ov. *Met.* 2.872 passim' ist falsch»); cf. also the variants *maris aequor(a)* (eg Verg. *Aen.* 3.495; Hor. *Od.* 4.5.10; Claud. *Pros.* 2.295) and *freta ponti/* (eg Verg. *Ge.* 1.356). For the phrase *vasti... aequora ponti*, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.780, *vastum maris aequor*; Tib. 1.7.19, *maris vastum... aequor*.

The poetic use of *vastus* to describe the sea comes from Catullus (cf. Catul. 63.48, *maria vasta*); but it is only through Virgil, who uses this term in a wide variety of contexts, that the adjective takes on the emotive connotations of fear and terror, especially in connection with the sea; cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 1.118, *in gurgite vasto*; 3.191, *vastum... aequor*; 421–422, *vastos /... fluctus* (= Stat. *Silv.* 3.2.129–130); 6.296, *vasta voragine*; cf. Fordyce 297 *ad* Catul. 64.156 *vasta Carybdis*; Lygd. 3.37 *vastos amnes* (comm.); cf. also Ov. *Ib.* 294, *inmensum... fretum*. The poetic use of *pontus*, however, goes back to Enn. *Ann.* 225, *mulserat huc navem compulsam fluctibus pontus*.

aequora: poetic plural; cf. Lygd. 4.87 *terga* (comm.).

ponti: on *pontus* in Latin, cf. H. Tränkle, *Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache*, Hermes Einzelschriften, Helft 15 (Wiesbaden 1960) 40.

86: the formulation of the line imitates Lucr. 2.705, *flammam taetro spirantis ore Chimaeras*; 5.905–906. However, the image of the "columns of fire" can ultimately be traced back to the "spirals of smoke" given off by the volcanic Mt. Etna in Lucr. 6.691, (*Aetna*) *crassa volvit caligine fumum*; cf. Verg. *Ge.* 1.472–473, *vidimus . . . Aetna / flammarumque globos liquefactaque volvere saxa.* In fact, *volvo* is the *vox propria* for the action of "emitting smoke or flames in the form of spirals"; cf. [Verg.] *Cir.* 2, *volvant incendia*; Stat. *Silv.* 4.4.80, (*Vesuvius*) *aemula Trinacriis volvens incendia flammis* (with Coleman 153); *OLD volvo* 7. For the image of the Chimaera spewing out fire, cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 7.785–786, *Chimaeram / . . . Aetnaeos efflantem faucibus ignis.*

flammam volvens: for the expression, *ThLL* 6.1.869.43 refers to Verg. *Ge.* 1.473 (*sup. cit.*); *Aen.* 4.670; Ov. *Met.* 7.109–110 *pectora* (scil. *taurorum Colchicorum*) *sic intus clausas volventia flammmas / . . . sonant*; cf. also, together with the *loci* cited in the previous note, Verg. *Ge.* 3.85, (*equus*) *volvit sub naribus ignem*; Sen. *Nat.* 6.11, *ingentem vaporem . . . volvant.*

ore . . . fero: for the phrase, cf. [Tib.] 3.7.71, *saevo . . . ore* (though used of Scylla).

Chimaera: the Chimaera (Χίμαιρα) is a fabulous animal, pictured in numerous forms, but always with some element of a lion. It is equally likely to be given the hind part of a serpent, with a lion's head and the torso of a goat (Hom. *Il.* 6.181), as it is to be depicted with more than one head, a goat's and a lion's. Out of its mouth and the middle of its body it belches out flames. It is the product of the union between the giant Typhon and the serpent Echidna, and therefore of divine race (Hes. *Th.* 319–325). It was brought up by Amisodares, king of Caria, and lived in Patara. The king of Lycia, Iobates, ordered Bellerophon to slay it, as it was ravaging his territory. With the aid of the winged horse Pegasus, Bellerophon achieved his objective. The story went that he put a piece of lead on the tip of his lance; the heat of the flames breathed out by the Chimaera melted the lead and killed the beast. On this fabulous monster, in addition to the passages cited in the preceding notes, cf. Pi. *O.* 13.90, Χίμαιραν πῦρ πνέοισαν; Lucr. 5.903–906, *qui fieri potuit, triplici cum corpore ut una / prima leo, postrema draco, media ipsa Chimaera / ore foras aerem flaret de corpore flammam?*; Hor. *Od.* 4.2.15–16, *tremendae flamma Chimaerae*; Ov. *Met.* 9.647–648, *Chimaera . . . mediis in partibus ignem, / pectus et ora*

leae, caudam serpentis habebat; *Tr.* 4.7.14, (*Chimaeram*) *a truce quae flammis separet angue leam*. The Chimaera appears as a monster of the underworld in Verg. *Aen.* 6.288, *flammis . . . armata Chimaera*; Hor. *Od.* 2.17.13, *Chimaerae spiritus igneae* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 278–279); Apollod. 2.3.1; Luc. *DMort.* 24(30).1; *Nec.* 14. Cf. also *OCD* 229 s.v.; Grimal, *Mitología*, p. 461 s.v.; Ruiz de Elvira, *Mitología clásica*, pp. 47, 303–304. As with Scylla and Charybdis this mythological creature also appears in a proverbial context, the image being applied particularly to *hetaerae* to emphasize their rapacity and irresistible powers of attraction, from Hor. *Od.* 1.27.23–24, *vix inligatum te triformi / Pegasus expediet Chimaera.* See in particular a striking passage of Anaxilas (*Fr.* 22.8 ff. K.), which also features Charybdis: ἔστι δὲ σκοπεῖν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς πρῶτα μὲν τὴν Πλαγγόνα, / ἥτις ὥσπερ ἡ Χίμαιρα πυρπολεῖ τοὺς βαρβάρους. / . . . πάντα τὰ σκεύη γὰρ ἕλκων ᾤχετ' ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας. / . . . ἡ δὲ Φρύνη τὴν Χάρυβδιν οὐχὶ πόππω που ποιεῖ, / τόν τε ναύκληρον λαβοῦσα καταπέπωκ' αὐτῶι σκάφει; Nisbet-Hubbard Od. I 317 also cite Anaxilas, *Schol. Town.* ad *Il.* 6.181, οἳ δὲ πανδοκεῖς εἶναι λέγουσι <Λέοντα> καὶ Δράκοντα καλουμένος, μέσην δὲ αὐτῶν πανδοκευτρίαν Χίμαιραν, ἣ τοὺς παριόντας ἦψε μεληδὸν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις παρεῖχε παρατιθέναι; Athen. 583 e; and a significant passage in which a Christian author who has read Horace uses the allegory to warn a young man against marriage, viz. Valer. *ad Rufin.* 2 (= 30.255 Migne), *Chimaeram nescis esse miser quod petis, et scire debes quod triforme monstrum illud insignis venustetur facie leonis, olentis maculetur ventre capri, anguis insidietur cauda virulentae.* For the representation of these monsters in the plastic arts, see the references in Austin 122 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 6.288.

87–88: note the expressive build-up of the letter 'r', *littera canina*, at the end of the hexameter (*redimitus terga caterva*), and of the 's' at the beginning of the pentameter in imitation of the hissing of the serpent (*tres sunt*), which was habitual in the Roman poets when referring to Cerberus, the watchdog at the gates of Hell, traditionally pictured as bristling with serpents (double onomatopoeia); cf. M.-P. Pieri, "Due immagini tibulliane", *SIFC* 45 (1973) 81 and 86.

87: the image of the back of Cerberus bristling with snakes goes back in Greek literature to E. *HF* 611 (and to the scholia on Hes. *Th.* 311), and in Roman to Enn. *Scen.* 415 (= 404 R.^{2}), *angue villosi canis* (= Sen. *Apocol.* 13; Schol. Hor. *Od.* 3.11.18); cf. also Pl. *R.* 9.588 C; Apollod. 2.5.12, κατὰ δὲ τοῦ νώτου παντοίων εἶχεν ὄφεων κεφαλάς. Another tradition, however, places the serpents on the dog's head,

like Tisiphone and the Furies; cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.11.17–18, *furiale centum / muniant angues caput eius* (scil. *Cerberi*); Verg. *Aen.* 6.419, *cui vates horrere videns iam colla colubris*; Tib. 1.3.71–72, *tum niger in porta serpentum Cerberus ore / stridet*; cf. M.-P. Pieri, *art. cit.*, p. 86. As regards the text, there is unanimous agreement that the traditional reading *consanguinea* is an error of transmission (only Broukhusius, Vulpius and Heyne maintain it; cf. Stat. *Theb.* 2.61) and that the disfigured text must therefore be altered to *canis* and an adjective derived from *anguis*. The only argument is centered on whether to write *anguĭnea* or *anguīna*. In support of *anguina* (Postgate, followed by Luck and Lee) is Catul. 64.193–194, *Eumenides, quibus anguino redimita capillo / frons*; in favour of *anguinea* is the fact that the mss. have *consanguinea*. The problem is not an easy one, since the confusion between the two adjectives also occurs in the mss. with respect to other passages (cf. Prop. 4.8.10, *anguino* [*anguineo*] . . . *ore*; Ov. *Tr.* 4.7.12, *ora Medusae Gorgonis anguinis* [*anguineis*] *cincta fuisse comis*). However, *anguina* has in its favour the combination with *redimitus* in the passage of Catullus quoted above, as well as the fact that *anguineus* is a much rarer adjective (only unequivocally attested in Homer. Lat. 891, *anguineis Clotho Lachesisque capillis*; Col. *Rust.* 2.9.10; 7.10.5).

canis: Κέρβερος, the dog of Hades, first named in Hes. *Th.* 311 (Homer mentions the dog of the underworld in *Il.* 8.368 and *Od.* 11.623–625, but without naming it), one of the monsters that guarded the kingdom of the dead, stopped the living from entering and, above all, prevented anyone from leaving (Hes. *Th.* 771–773). The most frequent image of this monster was the following: three dog's heads, a tail formed by a snake, and on the back numerous erect serpent heads in place of hair (E. *HF* 611). Other versions attribute it with not three (*belua ' iceps*) but fifty heads (Hes. *Th.* 312, πεντηκοντακέφαλον), or even a hundred (Pi. *Frg. incert.* 162; Hor. *Od.* 2.13.34, *belua centiceps*), all of them furnished with sharp teeth (καρχαρόδοντα is the term used in B. *Epin.* 5.60). In some Roman poets (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.419; Hor. *Od.* 3.11.17–18; Tib. 1.3.71) it is these heads, not the back of Cerberus, that are bristling with snakes, undoubtedly contaminating the model of the *dea anguicrinita* corresponding to Tisiphone and the Furies. Like most mythological monsters, it was the progeny of Typhon and Echidna (Hes. *Th.* 311). It was chained to the gates of Hell and terrorized the souls as they entered. Hercules, with the permission of Hades, and after a fierce unarmed struggle, overpowered it and dragged it out to the upper world, as

the eleventh labour imposed by Eurystheus (Hom. *Il.* 8.366 ff.; *Od.* 11.623; Frazer *ad* Apollod. 2.5.12; a burlesque version in Ar. *Ra.* 465 ff.). From the foam that fell to the ground from the mouth of the rabid Cerberus when brought up to the outer world came aconite (cf. Ov. *Met.* 7.408–419 [with Bömer 302–303]). Later, Cerberus was chained by Orpheus. For a description of Cerberus, important sources among the Greek authors are Hom. *Il.* 8.368; *Od.* 11.623–625; Hes. *Th.* 310–312; 767–773; B. *Epin.* 5.60–62; S. *OC* 1568–1578; *Tr.* 1098–1099; E. *Heracl.* 21–25; Apollod. 2.5.12; Luc. *Cat.* 28; *Nec.* 14; D.S. 4.25–26; among Latin authors, Hor. *Od.* 2.13.33–36; 3.11.15–20; Verg. *Ge.* 4.483; *Aen.* 6.417–423 (with Norden 242–244; Austin 151) and Serv. *ad loc.*; [Verg.] *Cul.* 220–221, *Cerberus et diris latrantia rictibus ora, / anguibus hinc atque hinc horrent cui colla reflexis*; Tib. 1.3.71 (with Smith 257–258; Murgatroyd 122); Ov. *Am.* 3.12.26; *Met.* 4.450–451; 7.408–415; 10.21–22 (with Bömer 21); Sil. 13.594; Sen. *Ag.* 13–14; *Her. f.* 783–821; Stat. *Theb.* 4.486–487; other *loci* in Frazer *ad* Apollod. 2.5.12; cf. also Grimal, *Mitología*, p. 97 s.v. 'Cerbero' and pp. 247–248 s.v. 'Heracles'; Ruiz de Elvira, *Mitología clásica*, pp. 47, 238–239, 385; *ThLL* 3.257.12–31; for artistic depictions, cf. bibl. in *OCD* 223 s.v. *Cerberus.* There are references to a dog of the underworld not only in Greek and Latin literature, but also in Indian, Celtic, Germanic, Armenian and Iranian texts, from which it can be deduced that this is a mythological monster belonging to the common proto-Indoeuropean heritage; on this question, as well as the etymology of *Cerberus*, see M. Bloomfield, *Cerberus, the Dog of Hades*, Chicago: Open Court, 1905; B. Lincoln, "The Hellhound", *JIES* 7 (1979) 273–285 (with bibl. in p. 273 n. 1). Cerberus as a symbol of insensitivity is a Lygdamean innovation.

anguina . . . caterva: the use of *caterva* to refer to a countless mass of animals is rare and restricted to elevated poetry (cf. Lucr. 6.1092, *pecudumque catervis*; Verg. *Aen.* 11.456, *catervae . . . avium* [= Stat. *Theb.* 9.27]; Stat. *Theb.* 3.532, *caterva* [*aquilarum*]; *Ach.* 1.557, *catervas* [scil. *apum*]), at least until Apuleius (cf. *Met.* 4.20, *Thrasyleonem nostrum catervis canum saevitium cinctum*); cf. also Aus. *Mos.* 84, *caeruleo fluitantes amne catervas* (*pisces*); Eust. 8.7 p. 953^c, *catervae vulturum*; *ThLL* 3.609.46–57. In addition, the combination of *caterva* with an adjective (*anguina*) instead of the usual genitive is extremely elevated in tone.

terga caterva: a studied homoeoteleuton reinforcing the effect aimed at in the expressive repetition of the *littera canina* (r). On homoeoteleuton, cf. Lygd. 4.52 *bella puella* (comm.).

terga: poetic plural. The use of the plural where prose would employ the singular became increasingly frequent in poetry, so much so that the term 'poetic plural' is generally used to define such cases. In dactylic lines, the nominative and accusative plural of neuter nouns in place of the corresponding singulars is found quite frequently, no doubt *metri causa*. Among the most widely-used are those denoting parts of the body, such as *colla*, *terga*, *pectora*, *corda*, *ora* (cf. Lygd. 5.14; 25). The origin of this poetic use may lie in a certain analogy with some 'pluralia tantum' like *nares*, *fauces*. On this question, see Löfstedt, *Syntactica* I, pp. 27 ff.; Marouzeau, *Stylistique*, pp. 222–223; Kühner-Stegmann I, pp. 82 ff.; Norden *Aen. VI*, Anh. V, pp. 408–409; Hofmann-Szantyr § 26, pp. 16 ff.; P. Maas, *ALL* 12, pp. 479 ff.; Draeger, *Historische Syntax* I, pp. 9 ff.; J. Flagg Gummere, *The Neuter Plural in Vergil*, Supplement to *Language, Journal of The Linguistic Society of America* 17 (1934); Williams 63–65 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 5.98; Austin 136 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 4.455; 193 *ad* 4.673; Barratt 7–8 *ad* Luc. *Civ.* 5.15.
88: possessive dative construction. The formulation recalls the familiar phrase *tergeminus canis* (cf. Prop. 4.7.52; Ov. *Ars* 3.322; *Tr.* 4.7.16); the variant *triformis* . . . *canis* in Sen. *Her. O.* 1202; Avien. *Orb.* 961; cf. Stat. *Theb.* 2.53 (with Mulder 53 *ad* Stat. *Theb.* 2.31, *ni deus* . . . *tergemino domuisse lumina* [scil. *Cerberi*] *somno*); cf. also Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.27, *tergeminus custos*. For the three heads, the three tongues and the triple bark of Cerberus, cf. also Cic. *Tusc.* 1.10, *triceps* . . . *Cerberus*; *Poem. frg.* 41, *tricipitem* . . . *canem* (= Hyg. *Fab.* 79.3); Hor. *Od.* 2.19.31–32, *trilingui / ore* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 331); 3.11.20, *ore trilingui*; Verg. *Aen.* 6.417, *latratu* . . . *trifauci*; Prop. 3.18.23, *canis* . . . *tria* . . . *latrantia colla* (= Ov. *Met.* 10.66–67, *tria* . . . / *colla canis*); Ov. *Am.* 3.12.26, *tria vipereo fecimus ora cani*; *Her.* 9.38, *esuros terna per ora canes*; *Met.* 4.450–451, *tria Cerberus extulit ora / et tres latratus semel edidit*; 7.414, *implevit pariter ternis latratibus auras* (with Bömer 304); 10.22, *terna* . . . *guttura*; Sen. *Ag.* 14, *trigemina* . . . *colla* (with Tarrant 167); *Her. f.* 785, *terna* . . . *capita*; 796, *per ora* . . . *terna*; Sil. 2.551; *forma* . . . *trifauci*; Stat. *Theb.* 7.783, *tergeminosque mali custodis hiatus*; Fronto p. 228.26 ff. N., *ei* . . . *cani trinas latrandi fauces ac trinos hiatus trinasque dentium formidines addidisse*. On the commonplace, see Eitrem, *RE* 11.271 ff.; H. Usener, *RhM* 58 (1903) 168 ff.; Frazer *ad* Apollod. 2.5.12; West 253 *ad* Hes. *Th.* 311–312; Norden 242–244 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 6.417–425; Immisch in Roscher II.1 1119 ff. The number of heads of Cerberus, though usually three, can vary—as with other many-headed monsters—for poetic reasons; in the plastic arts, however, for practical reasons, their number is generally restricted to three;

see comm. on l. 87 *canis*; West 253 *ad* Hes. *Th.* 312; Frazer *ad* Apollod. 2.5.12; Usener, *RhM* 58 (1903) 169–170; H. Thiry, "La polycéphalie de Cerbère (ca 540–400)" *ZAnt* 23 (1973) 261–272.

Although the Greeks only mention a single dog of the underworld, the many heads of Cerberus—whether two, three, or more—would seem to indicate that there was more than one hellhound in the oldest traditions of Indoeuropean myth; cf. E. Cook, "Ferrymen of Elysium and the Homeric Phaeacians", *JIES* 20 (1992) 248 n. 28.

cui: monosyllabic; the disyllabic scansion is only found in Sen. *Tro.* 852; 4 times in Martial (1.104.22; 8.52.3; 11.72.2 [with Kay 225]; 12.49.3) and twice in Juvenal (3.49; 7.211); cf. Tarrant 202 ad Sen. *Ag.* 146; L. Müller, *De re metrica*[2] 318; Neue-Wagener II[3].453.

89 Scylla: Scylla (Σχύλλη) was a sea monster, the personification of the unleashed waves who lived hidden in her cave, located in the island of Sicily, just opposite the lair of Charybdis, another sea monster, the personification of the whirlpool, that lived on the south coast of Italy. The two scourges of the sea watched over the straits of Messina. In Homer, Ulysses has to pass between these two monsters (*Od.* 12.73 ff.; cf. Ruiz de Elvira, *Mitología clásica*, p. 439) and from Homer onwards they tend to be mentioned together (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.420–421; Ov. *Am.* 2.11.18; *Met.* 7.62–65; 13.730–731 [with Bömer 401–402]; 14.75; Stat. *Silv.* 3.2.85b–86 [with Laguna 224]). As regards Scylla, according to the Homeric conception, she had six heads, each with a triple row of teeth, and twelve feet, and barked like a dog; whenever a ship passed by, as it sailed along the coast, she would would seize six of its crew and devour them at a single bite (cf. Hom. *Od.* 12.85–100 and 245 ff.). Later Hellenistic authors, however, picture her as a monster with the body of a woman from the waist up, but with her lower half girt with a pack of six ferocious dogs that devoured sailors as they passed; cf. Lucr. 5.892; Catul. 60.2; Verg. *Ecl.* 6.74–77 (= [Verg.] *Cir.* 59 ff.); *Aen.* 3.420–432; Prop. 4.4.39–40; [Tib.] 3.7.71–72; [Verg.] *Cul.* 331–332; Ov. *Am.* 3.12.21–22; *Ars* 1.322; *Met.* 7.64b–65; 13.732–733; 14.60–67; *Tr.* 4.7.13; *Ponto* 3.1.122; 4.10.25; Sen. *Med.* 351–352; further references in *ThLL* 3.256.55 ff.; for the frequent representation of Scylla in ancient art, cf. Waser *ap.* Roscher s.v. *Skylla*; *id.*, *Skylla u. Charybdis in d. Literatur u. Kunst d. Griechen u. Römer*, Zurich 1894, *passim*. On the metamorphosis of Scylla into this sea monster as a result of the jealousy of the sorceress Circe, who was also in love with Glaucus, see Ov. *Met.* 13.900–14.74; for the confusion and identification of the repulsive

Homeric Scylla with Scylla, the daughter of Nisus, king of Megara, cf. Bömer 252 *ad* Ov. *Fasti* 4.500; 217 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 7.64–65 and 402 *ad* 13.730–731. On Scylla in general, cf. also Stein, "Skylla", *RE* III A.1 (1927) 647–659; Grimal, *Mitología*, pp. 172–173 s.v.; Ruiz de Elvira, *Mitología clásica*, pp. 47, 289, 439, *466–467*; *OCD* 968 s.v. On the proverbial use of Scylla as a topos of cruelty, cf. Cic. *Verr.* 5.146, *non Charybdim tam infestam neque Scyllam nautis quam istum in eodem freto fuisse arbitror; hoc etiam iste infestior, quod multo se pluribus . . . canibus succinxerat.* On the proverbial use of Charybdis by orators and poets as a symbol of rapaciousness, avarice or wastefulness, an image applied especially to *hetaerae* (cf. Cic. *Phil.* 2.67, *quae Charybdis tam vorax?*; *De or.* 3.163; Hor. *Od.* 1.27.19 [with Nisbet-Hubbard 315]; Capel. 5.512; Sidon. *Ep.* 130.7; Hier. *Ep.* 14.6.2; 125.2), and of Scylla in late Latin as a symbol of envy, cf. Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 82 s.v. *Charybdis*; *ThLL Onom.* II C 384.9–25. As late as the 12th century, in the medieval Latin chronicle *Historia Compostellana* (*CC.CM* LXX), Scylla and Charybdis are referred to together in a generic sense whenever emphasis is placed on the perils involved in passing through a particular region; cf. *HC* 1.1.1 (in conjunction with the perilous Syrtes); 2.10.

canibus succinta: the phrase in relation to Scylla is traditional from Lucr. 5.892, *rabidis canibus succinctas . . . Scyllas*; cf. also Cic. *Verr.* 5.146, *multo se . . . immanioribus canibus succinxerat* (*quam Scylla*); Verg. *Ecl.* 6.75, *Scyllam . . . succinctam latrantibus inguina monstris* (= [Verg.] *Cir.* 59); [Verg.] *Cul.* 331, *Scylla rapax canibus succincta Molossis*; Ov. *Met.* 7.64–65, *cinctaque saevis / Scylla rapax canibus* (with Bömer 217); 13.732, *illa feris atram canibus succingitur alvum*; *Fasti* 4.500; Sen. *Med.* 351, *virgo Pelori, rabidos utero succincta canes*; G. B. Fletcher, "Latin Marginalia", *CQ* 25 (1931) 51; *ThLL* 3.256.55 ff.

virgineam . . . figuram: while *canibus succinta* is a traditional expression in connection with Scylla, the phrase *virgineam . . . figuram* is new, although it must be inspired by Ov. *Met.* 13.733, (*Scylla*) *virginis ora gerens*. For the phrase, cf. Ov. *Met.* 3.607, *virginea puerum . . . Forma*; 13.732–734, *illa* (scil. *Scylla*) *feris atram canibus succingitur alvum / **virginis** ora gerens et, si non omnia vates / ficta reliquunt, aliquo quoque tempore **virgo***; Stat. *Ach.* 1.742–744, *interea visu perlustrat Ulixes / scrutaturque domum si qua vestigia magnae / virginis aut dubia facies suspecta figura.*

virgineam: "characteristic of a young woman of marrying age". The term *virgo* is not only applied to a virgin (*virgo intacta*, Catul. 62.45), but by extension to any woman of marrying age, that is any young woman, and in epic it is applied to heroines in particular. For

the description of Scylla as *virgo*, cf. [Verg.] *Cir.* 71, *infelix virgo*; Ov. *Met.* 13.732–733, *illa feris atram canibus succingitur alvum / virginis ora gerens et, si non omnia vates / ficta relinquunt, aliquo quoque tempore virgo*; *Tr.* 4.7.13, (*credam prius* 11) *esse canes utero sub virginis*; Sen. *Med.* 351–352, **virgo** *Pelori, rabidos utero succincta canes, / omnis pariter solvit hiatus?*; Stat. *Silv.* 3.2.86, *Siculi populatrix* **virgo** *profundi*. Bömer (439 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.867) notes that the adjective *virginea* is more frequent in Ovid's epic works than in his earlier compositions (*Met.-Fasti* 32: elsewhere 7), probably because in elegy the corresponding noun is not *virgo*, but *puella* (cf. Lygd. 4.31 [comm.]).

figuram: "outward appearance, aspect, form" (cf. Ov. *Met.* 8.169, *geminam tauri iuvenisque figuram*. It is an example of the so-called 'accusative of respect' (or 'accusativus Graecus'), the function of which is to indicate the part of the body affected by the action of the verb (*succincta*); on this peculiar use of the accusative, attested in Latin from the archaic period (eg Pl. *Men.* 511–512, *non ego te indutum foras / exire vidi pallam?*), cf. Kühner-Stegmann 2.1.285; Hofmann-Szantyr 36–38 (§ 44); Ernout-Thomas 29 (§ 38 b); Bassols I.48–50 (§ 36).

90: the allusion to the wild lioness as progenitor within the cruelty topos is one of the most ancient; cf. E. *Ba.* 990; *Med.* 1342; Theocr. 3.15–16; [Theocr.] 23.19–20; Catul. 60.1; 64.154; Ov. *Met.* 9.615; *ThLL* 7.2.1078.9–13; the variant of the tigress is found in Verg. *Aen.* 4.367; Ov. *Met.* 9.613; *Tr.* 1.8.43–44; 3.11.3; Hier. *Ep.* 66.1.2; and in Ov. *Ibis* 229–331 it is a dog that acts as the animal wet-nurse.

conceptam: a clear echo of Catul. 64.155, *quod mare (te) conceptum spumantibus exspuit undis*.

tulit: for the use of *ferre* in the sense of "give birth", cf. Verg. *Aen.* 12.846–847, (*Dirae*) *quas et Nox . . . Megaeram / uno eodemque tulit partu*; Sen. *Herc. O.* 144, *num Titana ferum te Rhodope tulit* (143 *genuit*), this last example also with the cruelty topos.

saeva leaena: Lygdamus always uses the form *leaena*, never *lea* (cf. Lygd. 6.15 *fulvas . . . leaenas* [comm.]). The poetic use of *leaena* (< Gr. λέαινα; cf. Walde-Hofmann, *LEW* I³, 785) instead of *lea* dates back to Catul. 60.1, *num te leaena . . . procreavit*; in prose it is attested from Varr. *Lat.* 5.100 and Cic. *Glor. frg.* 12. Note the studied combination *saeva leaena*, modelled on Ov. *Met.* 4.102, *lea saeva* (cf. also Verg. *Ecl.* 2.63, *torva leaena*). For the word-pair *lea/leaena*, cf. Non. 134.7 M. (= 194 L.), *leae pro leaenae Lucr. lib. V* (1318); Char. 131.28 B., *leaena dicitur non lea, sed Ovidius . . . 'nec lea cum'* (= *Ars* 2.375); Prob. *Litt.* 4.82.27–28, *quaeritur qua de causa Vergilius 'haec leaena' et non 'lea'*

pronuntiarit; Bömer 51 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 4.102; 464 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 9.648 (cf. also 9.615); *ThLL* 7.2.1077.31–52.

91: alongside the fierce animals and fabulous monsters, there was also room in the cruelty topos for real geographical places, either with a reputation for being a danger to travellers (*Syrtis*), or else uncivilized areas which were accordingly prone to cruelty (*Scythia*).

barbara . . . Scythiae tellus: Scythia only reappears to form part of the topos of insensitivity in two other passages: Ov. *Tr.* 1.8.39–40, where the poet laments the disloyalty of a friend who has turned his back on him after his banishment into exile, and consequently cannot believe that he can have come into the world in such a civilized city as Rome, but rather *scopulis, Ponti quos haec habet ora Sinistri, / inque feris Scythiae Sarmaticisque iugis*; and Sen. *Her. O.* 143, *quae cautes Scythiae . . . genuit?*, in a passage that clearly depends on the Ovidian one for its echoes. It was Ovid, then, who introduced Scythia into the cruelty topos and, moreover, he mentions it quite appropriately, since he is trying to make his friend see that his disloyal conduct would suggest he was a native of Scythia, an uncivilized region where Ovid himself is in exile at that moment. This personal link is lost in Seneca and Lygdamus.

barbara: applied in Rome to anyone who is not Greek or Roman, that is, the uncivilized peoples (cf. *ThLL* 1.1735.69 ff.). For the use of this adjective applied to the Scythians, cf. Cic. *Verr.* 6.150; Ov. *Ponto* 1.3.38, *huc . . . ex ista barbarus urbe fugit*; the phrase *barbara tellus* is used to describe Scythia in Ov. *Met.* 7.53; *Tr.* 3.11.7; 5.2.31; Sen. *Phaed.* 166; [Sen.] *Oct.* 980; Luc. *Civ.* 8.392; Stat. *Silv.* 5.2.461; Avien. *Orb.* 1142; *ThLL* 2.1737.25–29.

barbara nec: the postponement of the particle *nec* is found in Latin poetry from the *neoterici* onwards (cf. Catul. 64.173; 210; 379; 68.55; 116) and is very frequent among the Augustan poets (*loci* in Norden, *Aeneis VI*, Ahn. III, p. 404; Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, pp. 94–95); in Lygdamus, cf. also 6.19 and 55. On the general tendency in Latin poetry to postpone particles in imitation of the Alexandrians, see the commentary on Lygd. 1.19 *sed.*

nec. . . . -ve: negative "neither . . ., nor . . ." correlation. More to be expected would be *nec . . . nec*, or else *nec . . . neve*; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 7.805; Tib. 1.2.95–96; Ov. *Ars* 2.108; Val.-Flac. 1.175, *nec nos . . . segnes credideris patriisve magis confidere regnis.*

Scythiae: the name was used to denote generically the region beyond the Pontus Euxinus, on the edge of the known world. It was

therefore a synonym for barbarism and the terrifying unknown (cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 1.65). Scythia had always been described as the land of inhospitable cold (cf. Hdt. 4.28.1, δυσχείμερος ... ἡ ... πᾶσα χώρη· ... ἡ δὲ θάλασσα πήγνυται; 28.2, ... τοὺς ὀκτὼ μῆνας διατελέει χειμὼν ἐών); later, the cold of Scythia becomes a poetic commonplace; cf. Verg. *Ge.* 3.197, *Scythiae ... hiemes*; 349–383 (a lengthy ἔκφρασις which undoubtedly established the topos and served as a model among the Romans, especially Ovid); Hor. *Od.* 4.5.25, *gelidum Scythen*; Ov. *Her.* 12.27; *Met.* 2.224; 8.788; Luc. *Civ.* 1.18, (*bruma rigens*) *astringit Scythico glacialem frigore pontum*; 6.325, *extremum Scythici transcendam frigoris orbem*; cf. R. Martín, "Virgile et la Scythie (*Géorgiques* III 349–383)", *REL* 44 (1966) 286–304. Owing to his *relegatio*, Ovid was one of the few Romans to experience personally the rigours of the Scythian winter; but given the poet's particular circumstances, for him Scythia is now not only the land of cold (cf. *Tr.* 3.10 [description of the rigours of winter in Tomis]; *Ponto* 1.3.37, *quid melius Roma? Scythico quid frigore peius?*; Luck *ad* Ov. *Tr.* 1.3.61–62), but also the land of isolation (from Rome and civilization; cf. *Tr.* 1.1.127–128; 3.3.3) and of savagery (cf. *Tr.* 1.8.40; 3.2.1; 11.55; cf. also Bömer 37 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 1.64); in short, a remote, barbaric and inhospitable land: *barbara me tellus orbisque novissima magni / sustinet et saevo cinctus ab hoste locus* (*Tr.* 5.2.31–32); cf. S. Besskich, "Ovid's Winter in Tomis. Zu *Trist.* III, 10", *Gymnasium* 79 (1972) 177–191; H. B. Evans, "Winter and Warfare in Ovid's Tomis", *CJ* 70 (1975) 1–9; Mª Cruz García Fuentes, "Pasado y presente en la elegía de destierro del poeta de Sulmona", *Actas del VIII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*, Madrid 1994, vol. II, pp. 659–665. After Ovid, cf. Pomp.-Tr. 38.7.4, *Scythiae ... locorum ... vel solitudinibus vel frigoribus instructi.* Elsewhere the Scythians, like other barbarians, are referred to as a people of severe habits, in order to reproach the Romans, in contrast, for their corruption and degeneration; cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.24.9 (and also the discussion of the passage and its connection with the present *locus Lygdameus* in G. Pasquali, *Orazio lirico*, Firenze 1920 [= 1964], p. 429).

horrenda: "inspiring terror". The poetic use of this adjective—with its undoubtedly epic tone; cf. statistics for Ovid: *Met.-Fasti* 11 times: elsewhere once—dates back to Virgil (cf. *Aen.* 3.658, *monstrum horrendum*; 6.10, *horrendae ... Sibyllae*). For its application to geographical accidents involving serious danger, cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.216, *Maenala ... latebris horrenda ferarum*; Stat. *Silv.* 1.4.78, *arcu ... horrenda fugaci Armenia*; applied to mythological monsters, cf. Ov. *Met.* 4.782–783, *horrenda*

(*Medusa*); 7.150–151, (*draco*) *uncis dentibus horrendus*; Homer. Lat. 875, *horrenda . . . monstra ferarum*. For other adjectives applied to the Syrtes, cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.6.3, *barbaras Syrtis* (= [Verg.] *Dir.* 53; Luc. *Civ.* 9.440; 10.477); Verg. *Aen.* 4.41, *inhospita Syrtis* (= Ov. *Met.* 8.120).

Syrtis: the Syrtes are two areas of sandy flats off the north coast of Africa, between Cyrene and Carthage, a proverbial danger for shipping: the Greater Syrtis (*Syrtis maior*), today the Gulf of Sidra, and the Lesser Syrtis (*Syrtis minor*), the modern-day Gulf of Gabes. Legends, possibly propagated to protect the Phoenician trade monopoly, exaggerated the perils of the Syrtic Sea. The name is first found in Hdt. 2.32.2 (in the singular); the distinction between the Greater and the Lesser Syrtis is known from Plb. 3.39.2. The Syrtes were described by Sall. *Iug.* 78; Mela 1.7; Luc. *Civ.* 5.484–485, *vadosis / Syrtibus incerto . . . aestu*; 9.303; Plin. *Nat.* 5.4, *tertius sinus dividitur in geminos, duarum Syrtium vadoso ac reciproco mari diros . . . Et terra autem, siderum observatione, ad eam per deserta harenis, perque serpentes iter est. Excipiunt saltus repleti ferarum multitudine, et introrsus elephantorum solitudines: mox deserta vasta*; cf. *OCD* 1032. The name *Syrtis* was sometimes applied to the surrounding country of hot and inhospitable desert overrun with wild animals and barbaric natives (cf. Butler 139–140 *ad* Apul. *Apol.* 72). On this, see the discussion on Hor. *Od.* 1.22.5, *per Syrtis iter aestuosas*, in Villeneuve *Hor.* (Paris 1954) 34 n. 2, and Nisbet-Hubbard *Hor.* I 265 and II 97 (*barbaras Syrtes*). In poetry, the Syrtes are usually mentioned in connection with the topos of insensitivity (eg Ov. *Met.* 8.120, *inhospita Syrtis*), or else in *propemptiká* as a symbol of the great dangers involved in navigation in ancient times (cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.22.5; 2.6.3; 20.15), often in conjunction with Scylla and/or Charybdis (eg Catul. 64.156; Verg. *Aen.* 7.302–303; Ov. *Am.* 2.11.18–20; 16.21–26; *Rem.* 739–740; *Fasti* 4.499; *Ponto* 4.14.9). On this commonplace, see Pease 121 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 4.41; Nisbet-Hubbard 265–266 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 1.22.5; Bömer 48 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 8.120; medieval examples in Walther 30948–30949. The singular *Syrtis* is also found in [Verg.] *Dir.* 53 and Ov. *Met.* 8.120.

92–94: a change of tack signalled by the adversative *sed*. Lygdamus now contrasts the previous seven examples of insensitivity with Neaera's family home, and her mother and father.

92: the formulation of this line is new. The mention of the parents in the following distich is a commonplace going back to the Homeric model, but the allusion to the family home is unparalleled.

culta domus: for the combination, Fletcher (p. 49) refers to Auson. 146.36 Peiper, *innumerae et cultae domus* (= 1.272.3v Evelyn-White; 195.36 Prete).

culta: "cultivated, civilized, refined in behaviour", in clear opposition to the *barbara* of the line immediately above (91). For the use of *cultus* in the sense of "refined", cf. Tib. 1.9.74, *senis amplexus culta puella fugit.*

non habitanda domus: for the expression, cf. Hor. *Epod.* 16.19–20, *habitandaque fana / apris reliquit et rapacibus lupis.* The poetic use of *habitare* in elevated poetry goes back to Verg. *Ecl.* 2.29, *sordida rura atque humilis habitare casas.*

domus: used in its double sense, both physical, as is shown by the phrase *non habitanda*, and metaphorical ("the family"), whence the combination with *culta*, which strictly refers to the inhabitants of the house or the members of the family. For this latter sense of *domus*, cf. Ov. *Fasti* 4.543, *mater . . . paterque nataque: tres illi tota fuere domus*; Lygd. 3.4 (comm.).

duris: the adjective *durus* ("insensitive") is the key term around which the topos of insensitivity always revolves (cf. the model, Catul. 60.1–3, *num te leaena . . . / aut Scylla . . ./ tam mente dura procreavit*). It refers back to the *dura pectora* of l. 76. On the elegiac sense of *durus*, see the commentary on Lygd. 2.3. Muretus and some early editions (*Veneta 1491, Aldinae 1502 et 1515, Plantiniana 1569*) read *diris*, with some of the mss.

93 longe ante alias omnes mitissima: an excessive accumulation (pleonasm). The comparative use of the preposition *ante* ("rather than") to indicate preference or superiority is originally characteristic of colloquial language; cf. Pl. *As.* 858, *ante omnes minimi mortalem preti*; *Cas.* 8, *placere ante alias veteres fabulas*; *Trin.* 824, *Neptune, tibi ante alios deos gratias ago . . . summmas*; Balb. *ap.* Cic. *Att.* 8.15a.2, *quem ante me diligo.* Later, however, it acquires importance in elevated poetry, especially in the combination *ante alios/as*, firmly established as an expression of comparison from Verg. *Ecl.* 3.78, *Phyllida amo ante alias* (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.321, *felix una ante alias . . . virgo*; 11.821, *fida ante alias quae sola Camillae*; 12.391, *Phoebo ante alios dilectus Iapix / Iasides*; [Verg.] *Cir.* 110, *ante alios . . . florebat in armis*; Tib. 2.4.24, *Venus ante alios est violanda mihi*; [Tib.] 3.19.16, *quae sola ante alios est mihi magna deos*; Ov. *Am.* 2.6.12, *tu tamen ante alios . . . dole*; *Ars* 3.534, *hic chorus ante alios aptus amare sumus*; *Met.* 5.476; 8.23; 10.120; *ThLL* 2.135.68 ff.). Prior to Virgil, the likely model for the expression, Ennius, had written: *o*

multum ante alias infelix littera theta (*Ann.* 625 V.). The use of *longe* to reinforce comparatives and, in particular, superlatives becomes general in the classical period (first in Catul. 64.215, *longe iocundior*; cf. Varro Atac. *fr.* 14.4 M., *longe gratissima*; Ov. *Met.* 12.586, *o mihi de fratris longe gratissime natis*), at the expense of the adverb *multo*, which is preponderant in archaic Latin (eg Pl. *Amph.* 782, *praestigiatrix multo mulier maxima est*) and now preferably reserved for the comparative (of the 'multo doctior' type). For the conjoint use of the two reinforcing devices, *longe* and *ante alios* (or *omnes*), with the comparative or superlative, cf. Catul. 68.159, *longe ante omnes . . . carior*; [Verg.] *Cir.* 473, *ante alias longe gratissima Delos* (with Lyne 295); Liv. 1.15.8, *longe ante alios acceptissimus*; Apul. *Met.* 9.14, *ante cunctas mulieres longe deterrimam*. The double emphasis of *ante alias omnes* is explained by the parallel development, alongside *ante alios*, of the expression *ante omnes*, of similar meaning (cf. Pacuv. *Trag.* 119; Verg. *Ecl.* 2.62, *nobis placeant ante omnia silvae*; Ov. *Met.* 10.167, *ante omnes dilexit*; *i.a.*) and also used as a reinforcer (eg Catul. 68.159, *longe ante omnes mihi . . . carior*). The confusion between the two expressions, and their conjoint use in one combined phrase, can therefore easily be understood (*ante alias omnes*); cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.347, *Pygmalion, scelere ante alios immanior omnis*; 4.141, *ipse ante alios pulcherrimus omnis*. For this comparative use of *ante*, cf. Kühner-Stegmann 2.1.532; Hofmann-Szantyr 223 (§ 117); Ernout-Thomas 171 (§ 198 b); Bassols I.241 (§ 239); *OLD ante* 8 *ThLL* 2.135.49–136.38; for *longe* reinforcing comparatives and superlatives, cf. E. W. Wölfflin, *Lateinische und romanische Comparation* (Erlangen 1879) 39–41; E. B. Lease, "Notes on Latin Syntax", *AJPh* 30 (1909) 300 n. 2; Hofmann-Szantyr 136 (§ 84 *Zus.* ß); Ernout-Thomas 172 (§ 199); Bassols I.169 (§ 152.1).

longe: frequent adverb in Lucretius (56 times) and in epic (Verg. *Aen.* 43; Ov. *Met.* 15; Luc. *Civ.* 16; Val.-Flac. 22; Sil. 18; Sen. trag. 10; Stat. epos 48), but comparatively rare in other genres: Catul. 6 times; Verg. *Ge.* 4; *Ecl.* 0; Hor. *lyr.* 1; Hor. *Sat.* 8(9); Mart. 7; Juv. 9; among the elegiac poets, it is rare in Prop. (4 times), Tib. (1: cf. 1.5.2) and the *Corp. Tib.* (1: Lygd. 4.93), but relatively frequent in Ovid's elegiac works (29). For the statistics, cf. L. Håkanson, "Adverbs in Latin Poetry", *Eranos* 84 (1986) 32 and 47.

mitissima: "mild of manner"; this adjective undoubtedly answers to the *saeva* of l. 90. For the antithesis *saevus/mitis*, cf. Sen. *Dial.* 5.10.4, *hic intra domum saevus est, foris mitis*. In addition, its use is strongly encomiastic, being a predominantly poetic epithet for the gods; cf.

Bömer 126 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 1.380 (*Themis*) *mitissima*; *OLD* *mitis* 5a; *ThLL* 8.1155.24 ff.

94: the compliment directed at the beloved's father is unprecedented in elegy; it is therefore an innovation on the part of Lygdamus, modelled on the compliment to the mother of the beloved.

is: the elegiac poets, like Latin poets in general from Lucretius on, display a clear aversion to the over-prosaic demonstrative pronoun *is*, especially in the oblique cases. As regards the nominative *is*, it appears four times in Tibullus (1.2.41; 42; 10.66; 2.3.33); in Propertius, in 2.32.1 and perhaps in 2.32.52 (other mss. read *hic*); [in Ovid some 40 times]. For Catullus, see Fordyce 294 *ad* Catul. 64.122; for Virgil, cf. M. Hélin, *RÉL* 5 (1927) 60 ff.; Austin 141 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 4.479; for the elegiac poets, see Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, pp. 116–117; for an overall view of the usage of the Augustan poets and Silver Latin, see Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, pp. 70 ff.; for Lygdamus, cf. 6.12 *eum* (comm.).

quo non alter amabilior: an elegant encomiastic Virgilian-style periphrasis; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.544–545, *quo iustior alter / nec pietate fuit, nec bello maior et armis*; 6.164, *quo non praestantior alter* (with Austin 90); 7.649–650, *quo pulchrior alter / non fuit*; 9.772, *quo non felicior alter*; 12.639, *quo non superat mihi carior alter*; cf. also Ov. *Met.* 12.405–406, *Hylonome, qua nulla decentior inter / semiferos altis habitavit femina silvis*; 14.623–624, *Pomona . . . qua nulla Latinas / inter hamadryadas coluit sollertius hortos*; Mart. 10.13.5–6, (*amicus*) *quo non est alter . . . / dulcior.*

non alter: ie "there is no other"; the use of *alter* = *alius quisquam* is regularly attested from the Horatian model *neque quis me sit devinctior alter* (*Sat.* 1.5.42) in negative comparative clauses of this type; in addition to the Virgilian models cited in the preceding note, cf. Ov. *Tr.* 1.9.25, *neque enim moderatior alter* (with Luck 76). For the use of *alter* in place of *alius*, cf. Lygd. 4.58 *alterius . . . viri.*

amabilior: "worthier of being loved (kindly, affable)". The poetic use of this adjective dates back to Lucr. 1.23 and Catul. 65.10b, *vita frater amabilior.* However, as noted by Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, pp. 102–103, *amabilis* cannot have been particularly poetic in tone when authors of the stature of Virgil, Tibullus, Propertius, Seneca, Lucan and Valerius Flaccus, *i.a.*, reject it completely, while in other poets it is extremely rare (apart from the passages of Lucretius and Catullus cited above, cf. Ov. *Ars* 2.107, *ut ameris, amabilis esto*, where the rhetorical effect justifies its use; 723, *accedet amabile murmur*; Sil. 8.609; 14.476). Only in Horace does *amabilis* appear with any significant

frequency (cf. *Od.* 1.5.10; 2.9.13; 3.13.10; 4.3.14; a few times in the *Epistulae*), undoubtedly reflecting his penchant for prose usages (cf. Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, pp. 98–113). For *amabilis*, "worthy of love", cf. also Hor. *Od.* 1.5.10–11, *qui . . . te . . . semper amabilem sperat*; Ov. *Ars* 2.107, *ut ameris amabilis esto*; Pichon, p. 83.

95–96: a ring-composition return to the apotropaic expression of the opening lines of the poem.

95: a formulation based on a cross between familiar apotropaic invocations, on the one hand *di melius!* (cf. Ov. *Met.* 9.497 and the commentary on l. 1), and on the other *di bene vertant!* (cf. Pl. *Ps.* 646; *Curc.* 658; *Trin.* 1155, *deos volo consilia vostra vobis recte vertere*; Ter. *Hec.* 196, *di vertant bene quod agas!*; *Ad.* 728; Liv. 10.35.14, *quod di bene verterent*; 10.42.7, *votum dis cordi fuit et auspicia in bonum verterunt*; Curt. 8.13.22, *incommoda quoque ad bonos eventus vertente fortuna*); cf. also E. *Med.* 911, ἀλλ' ἐς τὸ λῷον σὸν μεθέστηκεν κέαρ; Lyc. 1472–1473; Mosch. *Eur.* 27, ἀλλά μοι εἰς ἀγαθὸν μάκαρες κρήνειαν ὄνειρον; Plin. *Ep.* 1.18.5, *proinde dispice an tu quoque sub hoc exemplo somnium istud in bonum vertas.* For the expression *in melius . . . vertat* (Gr. ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον τρέπειν), cf. also Prop. 1.17.9, *in melius saevas converte querellas* (with Fedeli 406); Sen. *Phaed.* 408, *converte tristes omnium in melius minas.*

deus: for this indeterminate use of *deus*, cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 1.6, *deus nobis haec otia fecit*; Ov. *Fasti* 2.782, *audentes forsque deusque iuvat.*

crudelia somnia: for the phrase, Fletcher 50 cites Ov. *Her.* 10 (*Ariadna Theseo*) 111, *crudeles somni.*

96: the proverbial reference to the winds carrying something far away. For this commonplace, cf. Hom. *Od.* 8.408, ἄφαρ τὸ φέροιεν ἀναρπάξασαι ἄελλαι; Thgn. 1168, τῶν δὲ κακῶν ἀνέμοι δειλὰ φεροῦσιν ἔπη; E. *Tr.* 419; 454; *Supp.* 1155; Theoc. 22.167 (cf. Hom. *Il.* 6.345 ff.); 29.35; A. R. 1.1334; Catul. 30.9–10 (with Fordyce 166); 64.59; 142, *(verba) quae cuncta aerii discerpunt irrita venti*; 65.17; 70.2–3; Hor. *Od.* 1.26.1–3a; *Epod.* 11.16; Verg. *Aen.* 9.312–313; 10.652 (cf. Serv. *ad loc.*); 11.795; [Verg.] *Cul.* 382; Tib. 1.4.21–22, *Veneris periuria venti / irrita per terras et freta longa ferunt*; 5.35 (with Murgatroyd 171); Prop. 1.16.34 (with Fedeli 392); 2.28A.10; 4.7.21–22; Ov. *Am.* 1.4.12 (with Socas-Ramírez de Verger 8, n. 3); 6.43 and 52; 7.16; 8.106; 2.6.43–44; 8.19–20, *tu iubeas animi periuria puri Carpathium tepidos per mare ferre Notos*; 11.33; 14.41; 16.46; *Her.* 2.25; 7.10; 13.90; *Ars* 1.388; 631–632; *Fasti* 5.686, *abstulerint celeres improba verba Noti*; *Rem.* 286, *irrita cum velis verba tulere Noti*; *Met.* 8.134–135, *an inania venti / verba ferunt*; *Tr.*

1.8.35, *cunctane in aequoreos abierunt irrita ventos?*; Claud. 36.133 Jeep (= *Pros.* 3.133 Th. Birt), *procul irrita venti / dicta ferunt*). What is striking about the present example, however, is that it is dreams (*somnia*) that the winds are asked to take away here, whereas the proverbial expression is normally used, as in the examples cited from Ovid, or even Lygd. 6.27–28 and 49–50, in connection with promises and oaths to which no attention is paid, entreaties which are ignored, or threats which are not carried out (Otto, *Sprichworter*, pp. 364–365 s.v. *ventus* 2 [1865]). This unusual use may have its origins in the words and promises of Apollo. Nevertheless, the proverb of the winds covers a wider range than is expressed here; cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.26.1–3, *Musis amicus tristitiam et metus / tradam protervis in mare Creticum / portare ventis* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 303). For the «cliché des vents» to stress the fickleness of love or lovers, cf. A. Guillemin, "Un cliché de la poésie élégiaque et de la langue politique: ἀνεμώλιος-*ventosus*", *Mélanges P. Thomas. Recueil de mémoires concernant la philologie classique*, Bruges: Imp. Sainte-Catherine 1930, pp. 394–406.

The formulation of the line closely imitates Ovidian models; cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.8.19–20, *tu, dea, tu iubeas animi periuria puri / Carpathium tepidos per mare ferre Notos* and especially *Ars* 1.631–632, *Iuppiter ex alto periuria ridet amantum / et iubet Aeolios irrita ferre Notos*, with identical 2nd hemistich. However, the expression *irrita ferre Notos* ultimately goes back to Catul. 30.10, *ventos irrita ferre.*

tepidos . . . Notos: for the combination, cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.4.11–12, *nec Euris / da mea nec tepidis verba ferenda Notis*; 2.8.20, *tepidos . . . Notos/* (in the same place in the pentameter). The Notus is the south wind (cf. Plin. *Nat.* 18.328, *ventum Austrum . . . quem a Graecis Nothum diximus vocari*).

irrita: Cartault prefers the not impossible reading *impia* of the manuscript tradition. In his view, *irrita* is a banal correction. However, all editions since the *editio princeps* of 1472 prefer the reading *irrita*, which is found in some of the *recentiores*, in view of Lygd. 6.50 and other 'loci similes' (cf. Catul. 30.10; 64.142; Tib. 1.4.22; Ov. *Ars* 1.632; *Rem.* 286; *Tr.* 1.8.35; Claud. 36.133 Jeep [= *Pros.* 3.133 Th. Birt]).

V

In the present elegy, Lygdamus, confined to bed by intense bouts of fever, gives expression to his fear of death. Clearly detectable behind these lines is the loneliness of the sick man. His interlocutors are, on the one hand, the gods of the underworld (*di inferi*), whom he asks to respect his life for the time being, as he is still too young to die and has committed no crime that would justify his premature death; and, on the other, his friends (the main interlocutor), whom he imagines at this moment—since spring has arrived—relaxing in the thermal spas of Etruria, and whom he asks to spare a thought for him and pray for his health.

Structurally, the elegy can easily be divided into three blocks, following the changes in interlocutor: A) Lygdamus-*sodales* (ll. 1–5); B) Lygdamus-*dei inferi* (ll. 6–26), this 2nd block admitting of subdivision: a) Lygdamus-Persephone (ll. 6–20); b) Lygdamus-*dei inferi* (ll. 21–26); C) Lygdamus-*sodales* (ll. 27–34). Parts A and C also share the same *ego/vos* scheme of opposition ('priamel'). Part B is completely dominated by the idea of death; each subdivision is introduced by a formula pleading for pity (*parce* in l. 6; *parcite* in l. 21–22); in the 1st block (ll. 7–26) Lygdamus develops the arguments of innocence and youth introduced in l. 6 (*immerito iuveni*): he has committed no crime or offence that would make him merit his death (ll. 7–14: *immerito*), and in any case he is still too young to die (ll. 15–20: *iuveni* = *mors immatura*); in the 2nd block he expresses his willingness to die at the proper time, that is, in old age (ll. 23–26). With the final distich (ll. 34–34), Lygdamus brings together his two interlocutors, his friends and the *dei inferi* represented by *Dis*.

It should be observed that this is the only elegy in the cycle in which there is no mention of Neaera. Not only that, there is not even a reference to love (unless it is understood that we are here dealing with the elegiac motif of love as an illness). These striking circumstances have led some scholars to suspect that this is a poem that does not belong to the Lygdamus cycle, the work of another author. However, as is rightly observed by Tränkle 137, the same metrical, linguistic and stylistic peculiarities vouch for Lygdamean authorship, as do similar cases of convergence with other authors

and, above all, concordance with passages from the other poems of the cycle.

The source of inspiration always pointed to is Tib. 1.3, where a similar poetic setting is described: Tibullus lies ill in Corcyra and fears he will die all alone, unaccompanied by Delia and his relations. However, it should be observed that there is a similar background situation in Mart. 4.57.1–3, where the author contrasts his holiday in Baiae with Faustinus' sojourn in Tibur (Tivoli), another fashionable resort:

Dum nos blanda tenent lascivi stagna Lucrini
et quae pumiceis fontibus antra calent,
tu colis Argei regnum, Faustini, coloni.
quo te bis decimus ducit ab Urbe lapis.
Horrida sed fervent Nemeaei pectora monstri,
nec satis est Baias igne calere suo.
Ergo sacri fontes et litora grata valete,
Nympharum pariter Nereïdumque domus.
Herculeos colles gelida vos vincite bruma,
nunc Tiburtinis cedite frigoribus.

Note the similar use of *tenere*, the correspondence between *sacri fontes* (l. 7) and the *sacris Baiarum lymphis* in Lygdamus (l. 3), as well as the similar distribution of holiday spots depending on the time of year: Baiae in winter, in view of its mild weather; Tivoli in summer for its cool climate. There is another similar situation in Mart. 6.43 (*Baiae/Nomentum*). In the comparison of holiday resorts, therefore, Lygdamus seems to have received an important stimulus from Martial.

* * *

1–5: in order to underline the loneliness and abandonment in which he lies in his illness, Lygdamus contrasts his physical condition with the joy and repose of his friends in the Etruscan spas. Note, on the one hand, the unmistakable formal signs of the priamel structure *vos/at mihi* (cf. Lygd. 2.1–5 [comm.]; 3.31 *alii . . . mihi* [comm.]); and on the other, the linguistic echoes which make it clear that we are being presented with a clear imitation of the beginning of Tib. 1.3: */vos tenet* (l. 1) corresponds to */me tenet* (l. 3) and *nigram . . . horam* (l. 5) picks up *mors nigra* (l. 4). In addition, Tib. 1.3.2, *o utinam memores . . . mei* corresponds to *memores et vivite nostri* (l. 31).

1–4: ἔκφρασις τόπου (description of a place), common in loftier genres; see Murgatroyd 182–183 *ad* Tib. 2.5.23–24; Helzle *ad* Ov. *Ponto* 4.7.24; W. H. Race, *Classical Genres and English Poetry*, New York 1988, pp. 56 ff. It is characteristic of elegy to fall back on a detailed description of a place, in the style of the geographical digressions on places on travellers' routes, as the real introduction to an elegy (cf. Prop. 1.11.1–4; 3.18.1–4; 22.1–4; with Fedeli *Prop.* I 265; III 545–546). For further examples of this technique, cf. W. Abel, *Die Anredeformen bei den römischen Elegikern* (diss. Berlin: Hoffman 1930) 3 ff.

1: the formulation is strikingly similar to [Verg.] *Cul.* 48, *his suberat gelidis manans e fontibus unda/*. As regards the thermal spas of Etruria, cf. Str. 5.2.9 p. 227, πολλὴ δὲ καὶ τῶν θερμῶν ὑδάτων ἀφθονία κατὰ τὴν Τυρρηνίαν, ἃ τῷ πλησίον εἶναι τῆς Ῥώμης οὐχ ἧττον εὐανδρεῖ τῶν ἐν Βαίαις, ἃ διωνόμασται πολὺ πάντων μάλιστα. In the time of Augustus the *Aquae Caeretanae* were a particular favourite (cf. Strabo 5.2.3 p. 220), in the Flavian period, the *Aquae Passerianae* in Bolsena (cf. Mart. 6.42.6a, *fluctus Passeris*) and the *Aquae Apollinares* in Bracciano (cf. Mart. 6.42.7a, *Phoebi vada*), and, from the 3rd c. AD, the *Aquae Tauri* in Civitavecchia (cf. Rut. Nam. 1.249 ff.).

vos: scil. *amicos.*

tenet: on this use of the verb *tenere* to indicate the place where someone is, apart from its model Tib. 1.3.3, *me tenet . . . Phaeacia*, cf. also Tib. 2.3.1, *rura meam . . . tenent villaeque puellam*; Ov. *Ars* 2.420, *dea . . . quam tenet altus Eryx*; Mart. 4.57.1, *dum nos blanda tenent lascivi stagna Lucrini*; Apul. *Met.* 2.1, *me media Thessaliae loca tenere.* This use is similar to that of *habere*, as in *tellus habet aliquem*—cf. Ov. *Met.* 13.45–46, *non te, Poeantia proles, expositum Lemnos . . . haberet* (with Bömer 217–218); 313, *Poeantiaden . . . habet Vulcania Lemnos*—, an inversion of the more frequent expression *aliquis habet tellurem* (*insulam, urbem*); cf. eg Ov. *Met.* 8.8, *Alcathoe, quam Nisus habet.*

Etruscis: cf. *Tuscae* (l. 29).

Etruscis . . . fontibus: cf. perhaps Mart. 6.42.1, *Etrusci . . . thermulis.*

manat . . . unda: for the combination, cf. Catul. 65.6, (*gurgite Lethaeo*) *manans . . . unda* (where *manare* is also constructed with a simple ablative, without the preposition *de* or *ex*).

1–2 unda, / unda . . . adeunda: a studied combination of two rhetorical figures, anadiplosis (*unda / unda*) and paronomasia (*unda. . . . adeunda*), masterfully reproducing the lapping of the waves. Ovid had previously liked to suggest this to-ing and fro-ing of the waves by means of the 'undulating' rhythm in polyptoton of the term *unda*; cf.

Ov. *Met.* 11.496, *undarum . . . unda* (with Bömer 369–370); 553, *unda velut victrix sinuataque despicit undas/*; 15.181, *ut unda impellitur unda* (with Bömer 306). However, this rhythmic device is found in Latin literature as early as Acc. *Trag.* 569–570 (= *SRF* I, p. 255 Klotz), *hac ubi curvo litore latratu / unda sub undis labunda sonit* (where, in addition, the polyptoton is also combined with anadiplosis, as in Lygdamus); cf. also Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.176, *velut unda supervenit undam*; [Verg.] *Aetna* 319 ff.; Ar. *Ra.* 1403; Musae. 314, κύματι κῦμα κυλίνδετο (with Kost 520).

Anadiplosis ('reduplicatio'), a special variety of *epanalepsis* ('geminatio'), consists in the repetition of the last member of a syntactic or metrical group at the beginning of the syntactic or metrical group immediately following (/ . . . x/x . . . /). The aim of the picking up of the final sound of the first group is to intensify the expression or to complete the epexegesis. Examples in Virgil are *Ecl.* 6.20, *addit se sociam timidisque supervenit Aegle, / Aegle, Naiadum pulcherrima*; 10.72, *vos haec facietis maxima Gallo, / Gallo cuius amor tantum mihi crescit in horas*; Ovidian examples are *Am.* 2.14.38–39, *ipsa perit; / ipsa perit*; 3.10.19–20, *Cretes erunt testes; nec fingunt omnia Cretes / Crete nutrito terra superba Iove*; *Her.* 15.154–155, *ales Ityn. / Ales Ityn*; *Fasti* 6.419–420, *moenia Dardanides nuper nova fecerat Illus; / Illus adhuc Asiae dives habebat opes*; *Tr.* 4.8.24–25, *tempus erat. / Tempus erat*; 5.8.34–35, *posse puta: / posse puta.* On this rhetorical figure, cf. Lausberg, *Retórica literaria*, pp. 102–104 (§§ 619–622); on *epanalepsis* in the elegiac poets, see Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, pp. 33–35. On paronomasia ('annominatio'), cf. Lausberg, *Retórica literaria*, pp. 114–118 (§§ 637–639).

2: the summer season is not the best time to frequent the thermal baths.

sub aestivum . . . Canem: "during the dog days". The temporal sense of *sub* + accusative ("around", "about") originates in the classical period, from Caes. *Gall.* 7.61.3, *sub lucem*; *Civ.* 1.28.3, *sub noctem*; cf. Kühner-Stegmann II.1.571; Hofmann-Szantyr 280 (§ 157 b); Ernout-Thomas 34 (§ 45); Bassols I.260–261 (§ 270). For the combination *aestivum . . . Canem* (Gr. κύων ὀπωρινός in *AP* 10.12.7; 16.227.7), cf. Tib. 1.1.27, *Canis aestivos ortus vitare sub umbra*; 4.6, *aestivi tempora sicca Canis/*; cf. also Verg. *Ge.* 2.353, *Canis aestifer.*

non adeunda: "which must not be visited, impossible to visit". The same phrase in the same place in the pentameter can be found in Tib. 1.6.22, *sacra Bonae maribus non adeunda Deae*, and in Ovid's *Tristia*; cf. Ov. *Tr.* 1.8.18, *urbe* (scil. *Roma*), *meo quae iam non adeunda pede est*, and especially Ov. *Tr.* 3.10.76, *heu loca* (scil. *Scythia*) *felici non adeunda viro!*

Canem: ie the star *Sirius* (Gr. Σείριος) or the whole constellation of the Dog (*Canis Maior* or *Canicula*), in which Sirius is the brightest star, and which rises at the end of July, coinciding with the hottest time of the year; cf. Cic. *Div.* 2.93, *post solstitium Canicula exoritur*; Plin. *Nat.* 2.128, *ardentissimo autem aestatis tempore exoritur Caniculae sidus sole primam partem Leonis ingrediente, qui dies XV. ante Aug. Kalendas est.* Although the date on which it rises is July 19th, in practice the poets do not concern themselves with such technical details, and tend to refer to Sirius as an elegant metonym to describe the scorching heat of July-August, the dog days. The intense heat of the dog-star and its dire consequences for mortals—drought, fever, plagues—is a recurring literary motif; cf. Hom. *Il.* 22.26–31; Archil. 63 Diehl[3]; Verg. *Ge.* 2.353, *hiulca siti findit Canis aestifer arva*; 4.425–426; *Aen.* 3.141; 10.273–275, *Sirius ardor / ille sitim morbosque ferens mortalibus aegris / nascitur et laevo constritat lumine caelo*; Hor. *Od.* 1.17.17; 3.13.9–10; *Sat.* 1.7.25–26; 2.5.39; Tib. 1.1.27 (with Smith 191; Murgatroyd 54–55); 4.6 and 42; 7.21, *arentes cum findit Sirius agros*; Prop. 2.28A.3–4, *venit enim tempus, quo torridus aestuat aer / incipit et sicco fervere terra Cane*; Ov. *Am.* 2.16.3–4; *Ars* 2.231; *Fasti* 4.939–940; Sil. 16.99–100, *cum letiferos accendens Sirius ignes / torret anhelantem saevis ardoribus orbem*; Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.52–54, *tempus erat caeli cum torrentissimus axis / incumbit terris ictusque Hyperione multo / acer anhelantes incendit Sirius agros* (with Laguna 220–221); cf. also Plin. *Nat.* 2.107; 123; 128 (*sup. cit.*); 3.117; 12.58; 31.51; Cens. 18.10 p. 38.26; Isid. *Orig.* 3.70.14; Gundel, "Sirius", *RE* 3 A 1(1927) 342–343; A. Le Boeuffle, *Astronomie, Astrologie. Lexique Latin*, Paris: Picard 1987, pp. 80–82 s.v. *Canicula* (§ 217); *ThLL* 3.250.64 ff.; 257.44 ff.

3: the traditional *maxima* cannot be defended. The conjecture by Scioppius (Schoppes) *proxima* (*Paradoxae literariae* 16 ff.) is the most widely accepted. Confusion of *maxima/proxima* is well attested in the transmission of other authors (cf. Luc. *Civ.* 10.408; Vell. 2.127.1; Just. 14.4.12). For the use of *proximus* to indicate the second level within a classification (= *secundus*), cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 7.22, *proxima Phoebi versibus ille facit*; Ov. *Met.* 12.398, *pectoraque artificum laudatis proxima signis.* The Etruscan thermal baths would accordingly be the second best in Italy after Baiae, which was preferred by all, as is attested by Strabo (*loc. cit.* comm. on l. 1). *Principes . . . Baiae* is the name given to it by Martial (6.42.7). Fedeli *Prop.* I 316 and 460 suggests another possible meaning of *proxima*; according to him, *proximus* is used here, as in Prop. 1.13.29 and 20.6 (with Shackleton Bailey *Prop.* 41); Calp. Sic.

6.9–10; Quint. *Decl.* 3.4; Samm. 758, to denote similarity with no idea of inferiority ("alike in all respects", "of the same worth"). Other editors, for their part, offer the most varied and outlandish conjectures: *nunc aequans sacris Baiarum munia lymphis* (Vossius); *nunc augens sacris Baiarum munera lymphis* (Huschke); *nunc ante sacras Baiarum maxima lymphas* (Bach); *aemula nunc sacris Baiarum maxima lymphis* (Cartault).

autem: this adversative particle as a general rule occupies the second position in its clause, like the Gr. δέ, to which it corresponds. It is normally avoided in poetry, given its colloquial tone (cf. Hofmann, *Latín familiar*, pp. 5–6 [§ 3], 46 [§ 42]). The present case, in fact, is the only testimony of the particle in the whole of the *Corp. Tib.*: Lucr. 0; Catul. 4 (eg 64.167; 66.70); Hor. 3 (*Poet.* 53; *Ep.* 2.1.199 [with Brink 227–228]; 260); Tib. 0; Prop. 1 (2.32.29); Verg. 35 (*Ecl.* 0; *Ge.* 7; *Aen.* 28); Ov. 7 (*Am.* 2.2.28; *Her.* 3.145; *Met.* 6.284 [with Bömer 86]; 9.143; 495; 10.345; 14.489); cf. Kühner-Stegmann II.2.88; Hofmann-Szantyr 489–491 (§ 262); Ernout-Thomas 449 (§ 430 b); Bassols II.107–108 (§ 110). Nevertheless, in certain poets (in Virgilian epic, for instance) *autem* appears frequently enough to question the cataloguing of this particle as "non-poetic", although it is true that its appearance occurs in very specific conditions: in conjunction with another particle or pronoun (eg *ecce autem*, *ille autem*; *cur autem*); cf. Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, pp. 85–86; *ThLL* 2.1576.76 ff.

sacris . . . lymphis: cf. Mart. 4.57.7–8 *sup. cit.* and *infra* l. 29, *numina lymphae*. Each spring or stream was considered to have its own nymph or naiad. The names of naiads of famous springs were also well known, and each had her own legend. The naiads were frequently believed to possess curing powers: the sick would drink water from the streams consecrated to them, or, though more rarely, would bathe in them (cf. Grimal 372–373 s.v.). On the 'sanctity' of rivers, streams and springs, see Waser, *RE* 6.2 (1909) 2776–2780 s.v. 'Flussgoetter'; E. Goldmann, "*Di Novensides* and *Di Indigetes*", *CQ* 36 (1942) pp. 49–50 n. 9 (bibliography); on the different groups of nymphs, cf. Ruiz de Elvira, *Mitología clásica*, pp. 94–95.

The poetic use of the term *lymphae* (= *aquae*) is propitiated by the sacred character of water; cf. Lucr. 6.1178; Verg. *Aen.* 1.701; Hor. *Epod.* 16.48; *Od.* 2.3.12; Ov. *Met.* 2.459; 3.174; 3.451 (with Bömer 560); 4.298 *i.a.* In addition, in Latin popular mythology the name *Lymphae* was applied to the deities of springs, who were subsequently identified with the Greek nymphs (cf. Grimal, *Mitología*, p. 325 s.v.).

In fact, according to Fordyce (307 *ad* Catul. 64.254), *lympha*, originally *lumpa*, an Italic word for 'water', owes its written form to an etymological error that connected it with νύμφη; Varro, on the other hand, derives *lympha* directly, through dissimilation, from νύμφη (Varro *Lat.* 7.87), as do Paul. Fest. 120 and Prisc. *Gramm.* 2.36.22; 3.407.2; Walde-Hofmann, *LEW* I.833 s.v. *lumpa*; Maltby, *LALE*, p. 355 s.v. *lympha*; *OLD lympha* 2; *ThLL* 7.2.1942.21 ss.

Baiarum: *Baiae* (present-day Baia) was one of the most renowned summer resorts in Antiquity and its baths were a centre of the Roman 'dolce vita'. Its reputation as a place of perdition and moral ruin, suitable for love affairs and erotic pleasure, dates back to the republican period (first in Varro *Men.* 44 Bücheler, *Baiae: quod non solum innubae fiunt communis, sed etiam veteres repuerascunt et multi pueri puellascunt*), was reinforced in the time of Augustus (cf. Prop. 1.11 *passim* [with Enk 99–100; Fedeli 268]; Ov. *Ars* 1.255–256 [with Hollis 87]), and is solidly attested in the 1st c. AD (cf. eg Sen. *Ep.* 51.1 ff.; Mart. 1.59.1 and 62.5 [with notes by Howell 245–248 and 254–257]; 11.80, especially l. 1, *litus beatae Veneris aureum Baias* [with Kay 236]). The attraction of Baiae lay not only in its beaches but also the coastal lakes near the resort (like the Lucrine lake and lake Avernus; cf. Howell 254–255 *ad* Mart. 1.62.3) as well as its hot springs; cf. Prop. 3.18.2, *fumida Baiarum stagna* (with Fedeli 547); Ov. *Ars* 1.255–256, *quid referam Baias praetextaque litora Bais / et quae de calido sulphure fumat, aquam?*; *Met.* 15.713, *calidi fontes*; Stat. *Silv.* 3.2.17–18, *Baianosque sinus et feta tepentibus undis / litora*; 5.96, *vaporiferas . . . Baias* (with Laguna 387); 4.3.25–26, *aestuantis . . . / Baias* (with Coleman 110); 5.3.169–171; Flor. *Epit.* 1.16.4, *tepentes fontibus Baiae, Lucrinus et Avernus, quaedam maris otia*; Fronto, *Ad M. Caes. et invicem* 1.3.5 (p. 4.5–8 Van den Hout), *Baiarum ego calidos specus malo quam istas fornaculas balnearum, in quibus ignis cum sumptu atque fumo accenditur brevique restinguitur. At illi ingenui vapores puri perpetuique sunt, grati pariter et gratuiti*; Str. 5.4.5–6; *CLE* 2039.1, *cerne salutiferas sp[lendent]i marmore Baias, qui calidos aest[us tan]gere quaeris*. In fact, as early as 176 BC the region of Baiae was already being visited for the curing powers of its natural sulphur-springs (Liv. 41.16). In imperial times, Baiae combined its recently-earned reputation for immorality as a fashionable holiday resort with its age-old fame as a centre for health, thanks to the medicinal baths and its hot springs (for the latter point, cf. Vitr. 2.6.2; Plin. *Nat.* 31.4–6; Cels. 2.17.1; 3.21.6; D. C. 48.51; *i.a.*). The physical beauty and natural attrac-tion of the place are as well attested in ancient literature as

is its moral decadence; cf. Hor. *Ep.* 1.1.83, *nullus in orbe sinus Baiis praelucet amoenis*; Sen. *Ep.* 51.1, *blandissima litora*; Mart. 4.57; 11.80.1–2, *litus beatae Veneris aureum Baias, / Baias superbae blanda dona Naturae* (with Kay 236–237, who stresses the connection of Venus with Baiae, manifest in the Temple of Venus Lucrina erected nearby).

On Baiae as a place of delights and refined travels in Antiquity, cf. J. Shmatz, *Baiae* (1905–1906); L. Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms in der Zeit von Augustus bis zum Ausgang der Antonine* I[10] (ed. G. Wissowa: Leipzig 1922) 407 ff.; *RE* s.v. (Hülsen); D'Arms, *Romans on the Bay of Naples, passim* (cf. index s.v. *Baiae*); on its famed hot sulphur baths, cf. especially D'Arms, *op. cit.*, pp. 139–140 (with bibliography in n. 112) and Beloch, *Campanien*, pp. 180–189.

4: the commonplace that with the coming of spring the soil, hardened and contracted by the winter cold, expands or crumbles; cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.4.10, *terrae solutae*; Verg. *Ge.* 1.43–44, *vere novo, . . . cum . . . putris se glaeba resolvit* (cf. *Ge.* 2.330–331). The same topos is found applied to the heat of the day contrasted with the cold of the night in Ov. *Her.* 2.123, *sive die laxatur humus, seu frigida lucent / sidera.* However, some early editors (Broukhusius, Vulpius) preferred to read the line-ending *hyems*, following some 'Itali recentiores'. In support of this reading, see Luc. *Civ.* 1.17, *bruma rigens ac nescia vere remitti.* The image of harsh winter being softened by the arrival of spring goes back to the famous line of Horace, *solvitur acris hiems vice veris* (*Od.* 1.4.1). Cf. also the sense of "mild, not intense" of the verbal adjective *remissus* in connection with winter in Sen. *Dial.* 6.18.2, *hiemps . . . quae et remissa fuit et brevis.* The reading *hiems* offers the advantage of the contrast between the seasons: summer, winter and spring.

se . . . remittit humus: for the formulation, cf. Ov. *Fasti* 4.126, *vere remissus ager.*

purpureo vere: "with the radiant spring"; a Virgilian expression (cf. *Ecl.* 9.40, *hic ver purpureum*) which ultimately goes back to Pindar (cf. *P.* 4.64, φοινικανθέμου ἦρος ἀκμᾷ; *I.* 3.36, ποικίλον μηνῶν). Undoubtedly, spring is 'purple', that is, 'colourful', 'of many hues', 'radiant', due to the great variety of flowers; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 9.40–41, *hic ver purpureum, varios hic flumina circum / fundit humus flores*; [Verg.] *Dir.* 21, *purpureo campos quae pingunt verna colore*; Tib. 1.4.29, *quam cito purpureos deperdit terra colores*; Ov. *Met.* 5.390–391, *frigora dant rami, tyrios humus umida flores. Perpetuum ver est*; *Fasti* 4.126, *vere nitent terrae.* For *purpureus* in the sense of "brilliant", "shining", in descriptions of bright days,

especially dawn, cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.13.10 (with McKeown 345); *Her.* 4.160; 21.88; *Met.* 2.113; 3.184; 6.48; *Fasti* 2.74; 3.518.

5: from the point of view of content there is only one passage comparable to this in Latin poetry: Ov. *Her.* 21 (*Cydippe Acontio*) 48, *Persephone nostras pulsat acerba fores*, where Persephone, also in the role of sinister messenger of death, knocks with her foot on the door of the dying man's house, like Death herself in Hor. *Od.* 1.4.13–14, *pallida Mors aequo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas / regumque turris*.

Persephone: daughter of Demeter (Ceres) and Zeus, Persephone (Gr. Περσεφόνη, Περσεφόνειᾰ or Φερσεφόνᾱ) is the goddess of the Underworld and wife of Hades. According to the principal legend, Hades fell in love with the young girl and abducted her while she was picking flowers in the company of some nymphs on the plain of Enna, in Sicily. Her mother Demeter, the divine personification of fertile, cultivated ground, solemnly declared that the Earth would not yield fruit until she saw her daughter again. In alarm, Zeus ordered Hades to return her to her mother Demeter, but this was no longer possible, since in eating a pomegranate seed Persephone had broken the prescribed fast, which chained her forever to the underworld. However, to mitigate her suffering, Zeus ordained that Persephone should live for a part of the year in the lower world with her spouse, and the rest of the time in the upper world in the company of her mother. Each year, therefore, the arrival of spring coincided with the return of Persephone to the upper world. In Rome she was identified with Proserpina, Latin goddess of the Underworld. Cf. Carter in Roscher III, pp. 3141 ff.; Altheim, *Terra Mater*, pp. 15–16; *Glotta* 20 (1932) 155; S. Weinstock, *Glotta* 21 (1933) 46; Grimal, *Mitología*, pp. 425 and 456; H. Le Bonniec, *Le Culte de Cérès à Rome*, Paris 1958, pp. 295 ff.; Guirand, *Mitología General*, 237–238; Ruiz de Elvira, *Mitología Clásica*, pp. 69–73; Radke 263–267 s.v. *Proserpina*.

The use of the Greek form of the name is limited in Roman literature exclusively to poetry and only from Propertius on (cf. 2.13B.26; 28C.47–48), no doubt for metrical reasons, rather than *per colorem Graecitatis*. From the metrical point of view the differences are considerable, as *Pērsĕphŏnē* contains a dactyl and the initial *longum* of the following foot; it therefore often appears at the beginning of a line (eg Prop. 2.28C.48; Ov. *Met.* 5.470 [with Bömer 347]). *Prōsērpĭnă* on the other hand, in view of its metrical structure, is only used in the nominative—the only possible occurrence in the dactylo-spondaic metrical scheme-and always in the 4th and 5th feet. In the present

locus of Lygdamus, neither a Latinized nominative *Persephona*, unknown in poetry, nor the metrically inconvenient Latin form *Prōsĕrpĭna* could have ousted the Greek nominative *Persephonē*, the final long vowel of which acts perfectly as the first foot of a spondee (cf. M. I. Rebelo Gonçalves, "Helenismos onomásticos do *Corpus Tibullianum*. Aspectos métricos", *Euphrosyne* 16 [1988] 312). Virgil and Horace, however, exclusively use the Latin form *Proserpina* (in Horace with variable length in the 1st syllable: *Prŏserpina* in *Od.* 2.13.21); Ovid makes use of the two names of the goddess, both *Persephone* (*Met.* 3 times, *Fasti* 5, *Her.* 1) and *Proserpina* (*Met.* 3 times, *Fasti* 1). In the epitaphs only *Persephone* is attested; cf. *CLE* 422.2; 1128.6; 1161.4; 1301.3; 1988.4.

The allusion to Persephone in Lygdamus is a twofold one: on the one hand she is identified with spring (*vere*, l. 4), the coming of which signifies a reawakening of life for both the land and the poet's friends, who set off on holiday, while for him it is a harbinger of death: on the other hand, as goddess of the Underworld, she symbolizes Death itself, and as such she is a harsh goddess from Hesiod and Homer on (ἐπαινὴ Περσεφόνεια in Hom. *Il.* 9.457; *Od.* 10.491; Hes. *Th.* 796; Liddell-Scott s.v. ἐπαινός); in Latin *saeva Persephone* (cf. Prop. 2.28C.48) or *acerba Persephone*; cf. Ov. *Her.* 21[20].48). It should also be recalled that Proserpina is messenger of death. As such, she cuts a lock of hair (as an ἀπαρχή) from the person about to die; cf. E. *Alc.* 74, στείχω δ' ἐπ' αὐτὴν ὡς κατάρξωμαι ξίφει (with Dale 57–58); Verg. *Aen.* 4.698, *nondum illi flavum Proserpina vertice crinem / abstulerat, Stygioque caput damnaverat Orco* (with Pease 532–533); Hor. *Od.* 1.28.19–20, *nullum / saeva caput Proserpina fugit* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 330–331); Stat. *Silv.* 2.1.147.

nigram denuntiat horam: for the use of *denuntiare* in poetry in the sense of "to make a threatening warning, to threaten with" (= *minatur*), cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.366–367, (*Harpyia Caeleno*) *tristis denuntiat iras / obscenamque famem*; in connection with death, cf. Liv. 45.32.6, *qui non paruisset imperio, mors denuntiata*; Sen. *Ep.* 70.11, *cum mortem vis externa denuntiat.*

nigram . . . horam: for the expression *nigram . . . horam* to refer to the day of death, a 'hapax', cf. the use of *hora* to refer to the supreme instant of death in Verg. *Ecl.* 8.20, *divos . . . extrema moriens . . . adloquor hora*; Tib. 1.1.59, *suprema . . . hora*; Prop. 2.13.45, *dubiae . . . horae* (gen.); Luc. *Civ.* 9.87, *me cum fatalis leto damnaverit hora*; Stat. *Silv.* 2.1.54, *cuncta in cineres gravis intulit hora hostilisque dies*; and particularly the wide use made of the term in epitaphs, accompanied by a great

variety of epithets; cf. *CLE* 55.7 (= *CIL* 1.1214; *ILS* 5213; *ILLRP* 803), *properavit hora tristis fatalis mea*; 367.1 (= *CIL* 6.30119), *miserabilis hora*; 389.2 (= *CIL* 6.27278), *fatalis . . . hora*; 400.3 (= *CIL* 6.1454), *gravis . . . hora*; 447.4, *venit iniqua dies et acerbae terminis hora*; 563.5 (= *ILCV* 4805), *hora supprema*; 989.4, *hora gravis*; 1120.2, *debita cum fatis venerit hora tribus*; 1141.11, *letifera hora*; 1168.9, *mortis . . . hora*; 1189.10, *ultima hora*; 1295.3, *fatalis . . . hora*; 1314.3 (= *CIL* 11.5667; *ILS* 8132), *annos quos inmaturos abstulit hora gravis*; 1432.3 (= *ICUR* 2.4209; *ILCV* 3484), *flebilis hora*; 1884.1, *flebilis hora*; 1982.5, *leti venerit hora*. For the element of colour, see Prop. 2.24.33–34, *niger ille dies* (= "the day of death"). The expression can be traced back to *ater* or *atra dies* in religious terminology to refer to ill-fated days (cf. Afran. 163; Fab.-Max. 4; Varro *Lat.* 6.29; Liv. 22.10.6; Fest. p. 278 M.; cf. also Ov. *Ars* 1.418; Sen. *Dial.* 7.25.3; Ov. *Ibis* 62), a term which Virgil established in connection with death (cf. *Aen.* 6.429, *quos . . . abstulit atra dies*; cf. also Prop. 2.11.4, [*omnia munera*] *auferet extremi funeris atra dies/*). On black as a colour associated with death and the underworld, cf. Lygd. 2.18, *nigra veste*; 3.37, *nigramque paludem*; 5.33, *nigras pecudes*.

6 immerito: ie *insonti*; in the same emphatic position, at the beginning of the pentameter, in Tib. 1.6.72. For the sense of "innocent", "not deserving punishment", cf. also Hor. *Od.* 3.6.1, *delicta maiorum immeritus lues*; Ov. *Tr.* 2.274, *protegit haec sontes, immeritosque premit*; Lygd. 4.14; *OLD immeritus* 1a. For the important role of the *meritum* (fere i. q. *culpa*, "feeling of moral culpability") in Roman religion, particularly in the face of misfortune or death, see the numerous *loci* cited by Bömer 311 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.279 *merui*; 339 *ad* 2.393 *meruisse necem*; 375 *ad* 2.551 *meritum*; Hofmann, *Gymnasium* 72 (1965) 457.

iuveni: Lygdamus here anticipates the second argument in his defence (ll. 15–27): he is too young to die. The topos of early death (*inmatura mors*, ἄωρος θάνατος) is frequent in epitaphs and in consolation literature (cf. B. Lier, "Topica carminum sepulcralium latinorum", *Philologus* 52 (1903) 453–454; R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin epitaphs* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press 1962) 184–198; R. Kassel, *Untersuchungen zur griechischen und römischen Konsolationsliteratur* (München: Zetemata n. 18: 1958) 80–82.

As regards the division of human life into stages depending on age, some authors fix three ages, while others speak of four; among the former, cf. Aelius Tubero *Frg.* 4 (*HRR* I^2 309 Peter) in Gell. 10.28, *'pueros' esse . . ., qui minores essent annis septem decem atque inde . . . milites scripsisse eosque ad annum quadragesimum sextum 'iuniores' supraque*

eum annum 'seniores' appellasse; among the latter, see Varro in Cens. 14.2, *primo gradu usque ad XV annum 'pueros' dictos . . ., secundum ad tricensimum annum 'adulescens' . . ., in tertio qui erant usque ad quinque et quadraginta annos, 'iuvenes' appellatos, . . . in quarto . . . 'seniores' vocitatos* (cf. the exhaustive assessment of B. Axelson, "Die Synonyme adulescens und iuvenis", *Mélanges J. Marouzeau* [Paris 1948] 7–17); cf. also Ov. *Met.* 15.199–213, where Ovid establishes a correspondence between the four seasons of the year and four stages in human life; in this respect, see P. Colmant, "Les quatre âges de la vie", *Les Études classiques* 24 (1956) 58–63 (on Hor. *Poet.* 153–175); the extensive article by Don Slusanski, "Le vocabulaire latin des *gradus aetatum*", *RRL* 19 (1974) with bibl. on pp. 2–5; A. García Leal, "Juventud y vejez en Tibulo", *Simposio Tibuliano*, Univ. de Murcia 1985, pp. 255–262. Although the limits are somewhat imprecise, and even more so in poetry, in general a man between between 15/17 and 40/45 years of age would be regarded as *iuvenis* (*ThLL* 7.2.73481 ff.; however, cf. *CLE* 2107 B 4, *qui quinquaginta iuvenis dum degeret annos*). For the notion of *puer*, see J. Maurin, *Remarques sur la notion de 'puer' à l'époque classique*, Bull. Budé, Paris 1975; for *senex*, cf. É. Évrard, "Vieux et ancien chez Tibulle", *Latomus* 37 (1978) 126 ff. (especially p. 135 with n. 19).

parce nocere: the poetic use of the periphrastic form *parce* (*parcite*) + infinitive ("cease doing" = "do not do") as a polite prohibition formula in place of the imperative, which is always avoided by the Romans as far as possible in prohibitions, goes back to Verg. *Ecl.* 3.94, *parcite, oves, nimium procedere*; cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 3.42, *parce pias scelerare manus*; Hor. *Od.* 3.8.26; Tib. 1.6.51, *parcite . . . violare puellam*; Prop. 1.15.26, *oblitos parce movere deos*; the expression is particularly Ovidian: *Am.* 1.2.50 (with McKeown 58); *Her.* 5.43; 16.281; 18.203; 20.115; 117; *Ars* 3.457, *parcite, Cecropides, iuranti credere Theseo*; *Rem.* 3; 645; *Met.* 10.545, *parce . . . iuvenis, temerarius esse* (with Bömer 184); 15.75–76, *parcite, mortales, dapibus temerare nefandis / corpoa!* (with Bömer 278); 174–175, *parcite . . . cognatas caede nefanda / exturbare animas*; *Fasti* 4.204; *Tr.* 3.3.51, *parce . . . lacerare genas*; 11.32; 5.9.34; 11.30; Luc. *Civ.* 7.659; 10.395, *tu parce morari*; [Sen.] *Oct.* 270, *renovare luctus parce*; Sil. 17.27, *cladi parce obvius ire*; *ThLL* 10.1.332.19 ff.; *OLD parco* 2c. However, the expression is, for the most part, rare in the more elevated poetic registers, even though poets also avoid the prohibition formula *noli* (*nolite*) + infinitive—cf., however, Lucr. 4.386; Prop. 2.18B.37; 24C.49; once in the *Metamorphoses* (Ov. *Met.* 11.662, *falso tibi me promittere noli* [with Bömer 413]); 8 times in Ovid's elegiac works; but never in

Hor. *Od.*, Verg., Tib., Sen. *Trag.*, Luc., Val.-Flac., Sil.)—used profusely by prose-writers as an alternative to the negative imperative (cf. Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, p. 135). Before Apuleius (eg *Apol.* 23, *parce postea, Aemiliane, paupertatem cuipiam obiectare*), the expression of prohibition with *parce* in prose is only found in Liv. 34.32.20 (*parce . . . fidem ac iura societatis iactare*), albeit in a speech that is notable for its colloquial *color*, which may suggest an equally colloquial tone in the origin of the formula. This colloquial origin can be detected in Pl. *Persa* 312, *vomicast, pressare parce*, and may have stemmed from formulations in which the literal sense of *parcere* ("to spare", "to save" > "to forbear from") can still be felt, such as Pl. *Ep.* 464, *quid ego apud te vera precam proloqui?*; Catul. 64.146, *nihil promittere parcunt*, or Ov. *Am.* 1.2.50 (*sup. cit.*). For the expression of prohibition with *parce*, cf. Flechter, *Latomus* 31 (1972) 488; Kühner-Stegmann II.1.202; Hofmann-Szantyr 337 (§ 186 III); Ernout-Thomas 233 (§ 251 B 3); Bassols I.337–338 (§ 362). For *fuge* + infinitive, another strictly poetic and extremely rare prohibition formula, cf. Lucr. 1.1052; Hor. *Od.* 1.9.13 (with Nisbet-Hubbard 122); 2.4.22; Tib. 1.4.9, *o fuge te tenerae puerorum credere turbae* (with Smith 266 and Murgatroyd 135); Pers. 6.65; Stat. *Theb.* 9.139. For the poetic prohibition formula *desine* + infinitive, see Lygd. 4.4 (comm.); 80; cf. also Luc. *Civ.* 5.744, *desiste preces temptare* (with Barratt 246–247). The norm, however, is to use the formula *ne* + subjunctive to express negative commands (cf. Bömer *ad* Ov. *Met.* 6.30, *consilium ne sperne meum*). For *parce/-ite* as a habitual formula in prayers to the gods, cf. l. 21 (comm.).

7–14: arguments backing the declaration of innocence of the previous line (*immerito*, l. 6), consisting of a lengthy list (four distichs) of grave crimes he has not committed. Analogous protestations of innocence can be found elsewhere in Roman literature (cf. Tib. 1.2.81–84; 3.51–52; Lygd. 4.15–16; Prop. 2.28.9–14; [Verg.] *Lydia* 51 ff.; Stat. *Silv.* 5.5.3 ff.; Petr. *Satyr.* 133.3 l. 6 ff.; Claud. *Pros.* 2.255 ff.). However, unlike these other passages, which put forward the hypothesis of serious offences having been committed as an explanation for grave misfortune or serious illness, Lygdamus categorically denies such a possibility (*non ego . . . nec. . . . nec. . . . nec . . . nec . . .*). This detail reveals his close dependence on Tib. 1.3.51–52, *parce, pater, timidum* **non** *me periuria terrent, /* **non** *dicta in sanctos impia verba deos.* Note, too, that both elegists use the motif in connection with illness, and that the two authors strikingly coincide in a series of details: *parce, pater* with *parce . . ., dea!* (l. 6); *non dicta in sanctos impia*

verba deos with *nec . . . impia in adlines solvimus ora deos* (ll. 13–14), and the use of categorical correlative denials. There is a similarity with two passages of Ovid, which are also structured in the form of *aversiones* (*non [ego] . . .*):

a) *Am.* 2.2.64–66:

> ***Non** scelus adgredimur, **non** ad miscenda coimus*
> *toxica, **non** stricto fulminat ense manus;*
> *Quaerimus ut tuto per te possimus amare:*
> *quid precibus nostris mollius esse potest?*

b) *Ponto* 2.9.67–72:

> ***Non ego** caede nocens in Ponti litora veni,*
> *mixtave sunt nostra dira venena manu:*
> ***nec** mea subiecta convicta est gemma tabella*
> *mendacem linis inposuisse notam.*
> ***Nec** quicquam, quod lege vetor committere, feci:*
> *est tamen his gravior noxa fatenda mihi.*

Note that both passages of Ovid contain a series of elements which would appear to be permanent features in this type of *aversio*: 1) the generic allusion to crime in order to avoid any omission (*scelus* in *Am.* 2.2.64, *caede* in *Ponto* 2.9.67; *facta nefanda* in Lygd. 6.12); 2) poison (*Am.* 2.2.64–65a; *Ponto* 2.9.68; Lygd. 6.9–10); 3) the hand that committed the crime (*Am.* 2.2.65 *manus*; *Ponto* 2.9.68 *nostra . . . manu*; Lygd. 6.9–10 *mea dextera*). In a third passage of Ovid can be observed, once again, the use of this rhetorical figure to protest one's innocence in relation to a punishment that is seen as unjust (*Ponto* 2.2.9–16):

> ***Non ego** concepi, si Pelion Ossa tulisset,*
> *clara mea tangi sidera posse manu,*
> *nec nos Enceladi dementia castra secuti*
> *in rerum dominos movimus arma deos,*
> *nec, quod Tydidae temeraria dextra fecit,*
> *numina sunt telis ulla petita meis.*
> *Est mea culpa gravis, sed quae me perdere solum*
> *ausa sit, et nullum maius adoperta nefas.*

Note the presence of some of the traditional elements of this motif: 1) the allusion to crime, this time emphatically centered on the gravest offence, sacrilege (in view of Augustus' being considered a god, from whom the exiled Ovid hopes to obtain pardon); 2) *dementia* (= Lygd. 5.13, *insanae . . . mentis*) or the sin of pride (ὕβρις) which pushes one

to offend the gods; 3) the express mention of the 'criminal hand' (*temeraria dextra*, l. 13).

In spite of the length of the list, note how Lygdamus has attempted to vary the expression as far as possible. Thus, for instance, the subject changes from the first person (*ego/nos*) to parts of the human body (*dextera*) and to the crimes themselves (*facta nefanda*). For the rhetorical figure of *aversio*, cf. Lygd. 2.5 (comm.).

L. Koenen ("Die Unschuldsbeteuerungen des Priestereides und die römische Elegie", *ZPE* 2 [1967] 31–38) suggested that both Tib. 1.3.51–52 and Lygd. 5.7–14 refer to the Egyptian rite of "negative confession" practised by the priests and initiates of the mysteries of Isis, pointing to the similarity of expression between Lygd. 5.11, which he somewhat arbitrarily reconstructs as *nec nos sacrilegi templis admovimus ungues* (ignes *G*², *plerique edd.*), and the oath of an Egyptian priest preserved in a papyrus: οὐδε οὐ μὴ κολλήσω τοὺς δακτύλου[ς τῷ ἱερῷ] (SB 6,9641); for the Egyptian oath, cf. R. Merkelbach, "Ein ägyptischer Priestereid", *ZPE* 2 (1968) 1–30. Years later, L. Koenen ("Egyptian Influence in Tibullus", *ICS* 1 (1976) 127–159) pointed to a similar expression in Petronius: *non templis impius hostis / admovi dextram* (*Satyr.* 133.3.7–8) and detected further "negative confessions" in Lygd. 4.15–16; Tib. 1.3.51–52; Prop. 1.16.37–38; 2.28.9 ff.; 4.11.41 (*art. cit.*, p. 129 and n. 11). M. Parca ("The position of Lygdamus in Augustan Poetry", *St. in Lat. Lit. and Rom. Hist.* 4 [1986] 467) concludes that "Lygdamus was familiar with the mysteries of Isis and that his mistress Neaera was a devotee" and, on the basis of an arbitrary consideration of Petronius as an imitator of Lygdamus, refutes the late dating of the Lygdamus cycle ("the linguistic parallel between Lygdamus' and Petronius' lines prompts one to observe that the author of the *Satyricon* had Lygdamus' poem in mind when he wrote Polyaenos' prayer, and that he thus parodied a common elegiac theme").

7–8: the elegist exonerates himself from the crime of sacrilege. The distich presents difficulties concerning both the text and the content. The reading *deorum* at the end of the hexameter, as transmitted by the mss. cannot be maintained. Equally unsatisfactory is the reading *piorum* (ie *initiatorum*) of some 'Itali', which is only followed by Huschke. Most editors accept as valid the reading *virorum* (Scaliger ex Cuiaciano). Only F. H. Sandbach (*CR* 2 [1952] 6–7) proposes *reorum* ("criminals"), a conjecture accepted by Lee. As regards the content, most of the early commentators held that the distich referred to a violation

of the precept of silence that hung over the Eleusinian mysteries. *Docere* fits in well with this interpretation, even if we might expect *vulgare*, *edere* or the like (cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.2.26–27, *qui Cereris sacrum volgarit arcanae*; Ov. *Ars* 2.601–602, *quis Cereris ritus ausit volgare profanis*), and *virorum* in this case denotes people in general, with no distinction of sex, as is attested in elevated poetry (cf. Catul. 64.192; Verg. *Ge.* 3.9; Ov. *Met.* 1.286). In the view of these commentators *laudandae . . . deae* is an indirect allusion to the ἐπαινὴ Περσεφόνεια of Homer and Hesiod (eg *Il.* 9.457; *Od.* 10.491; *Th.* 768), since they connect this much-debated adjective ἐπαινὴ ("terrible") with ἔπαινος ("praiseworthy"), as did some scholiasts and lexicographers of Antiquity (cf. Sch. ADT *Il.* 9.457; Sch. Hes. *Op.* 643; Hsch. E 4089 s.v. ἐπαινή; Plut. *Aud. poet.* 5 p. 23 a; Triph. 52). For his part, Sandbach (*art. cit.*, p. 7) supports his emendation (*reorum*) by reference to the prohibition by which those convicted of a crime could not attend the Eleusinian mysteries (Suet. *Nero* 34; cf. Farnell, *Cults*, 3.355). However, when the Roman poets refer to these mysteries, they are usually thinking of Demeter, and not of her daughter Persephone. Modern commentators therefore prefer to see—in line with the general opinion since Heyne, who cites Tib. 1.6.22, *sacra Bonae maribus non adeunda deae*—a generalizing allusion in these two lines to the scandal of the rites of the *Bona Dea* in 62 BC. *Virorum* would then be used in its strict sense and *laudandae . . . deae* would be a periphrasis for the usual name of the goddess. Tränkle 142 accepts this interpretation, but sees *docere* as out of place here, since what was forbidden for men in relation to the cult of the *Bona Dea* was participation in the ceremony of sacrifice which took place at the beginning of December, as well as entrance to the temple on the Aventine (cf. Cic. *Har.* 37): the main risk lay not in revealing the cult but in witnessing and becoming familiar with it. Among the possible emendations, Tränkle highlights two proposals: *cernere sacra* (Voss), following Ov. *Met.* 3.710, *oculis illum cernentem sacra profanis*, and *sacra videre* (Erath) where, for the copyist's error, he refers to Pers. 1.69, for which some mss. give *docemus*, and others *videmus*, the editors having reached no agreement on the correct reading. For the formulation of the distich, in addition to Tib. 1.6.21–22 *sup. cit.*, cf. Prop. 4.9.25–26, *femineae loca clausa deae fontesque piandos / impune et nullis sacra retecta viris*; 69, *haec* (scil. *Ara Maxima*) *nullis unquam pateat veneranda puellis*. In fact, in all the mystery cults, as is made clear in the examples cited, there were two possible offences for initiates: witnessing them and spreading the word about them.

Lygdamus alludes to the first by means of *temerare*, to the second by *docere*, a variant *metri causa* of *vulgare*, *edere* or the *retegere* of Prop. 4.9.26 *sup. cit.*; there is therefore no need to modify *docere* in order to force an allusion to the main offence.

7 non ego: for this frequent line-beginning, characteristic of *aversio*, cf. Lygd. 2.5 (comm.).

temeranda: the poetic use of the verb *temerare*—of relatively recent formation from the adverb *temere*—in the sense of to "profane" something protected by religious sanctions (cf. Paul. Fest. p. 501: *temerare, violare sacra, et contaminare, dictum videlicet a temeritate*) dates back to Verg. *Aen.* 6.840, *ultus avos Troiae templa et temerata Minervae* (in prose, to Liv. 26.13.13); Hor. 0; Tib. 0; Prop. 0; Ovid. 19 (8 *Met.* + *Fasti*). For the desacralized use of the term in Ovid, cf. McKeown *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.8.19, *thalamos temerare pudicos*). The same connotations of offence against a divinity are frequently carried by the adjective *temerarius*; cf. Ov. *Ponto* 2.2.13–14, *nec, quod Tydidae* (cf. 31 ff.) *temeraria dextera fecit, / numina sunt telis ulla petita meis.*

8 laudandae . . . deae: scil. *Bona Dea*. On this goddess, cf. Wissowa, *RE* 3.1 686.64–694.8; A. Greifenhagen, "Bona Dea", *Röm. Mitt.* (1937) 227 ff.; T. P. Wiseman, *Cinna the Poet* (Leicester 1974) ch. 7; *OCD* 172 and Grimal 71–72 s.v. *Bona Dea*. According to K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (München 1960) 228 ff., her name is simply a literal translation of Agathe Theos, a Greek goddess related to Hygieia. In the books of the Pontifices the goddess was called *Bona*, *Fauna*, *Ops* and *Fatua* (Macr. *Sat.* 1.12.21). She was identified with various goddesses, including Damia, Maia, Juno, Proserpina and Hecate (Macr. *loc. cit.*; Paul. Fest. p. 68M) and is linked with the cult of Faunus, as daughter or sister, or else as wife (Macr. *Sat.* 1.12.24–25; 27; Serv. *Aen.* 8.314; Plu. *Mor.* 268d–e; Arn. 5.190.2 Reifferscheid; Lact. *Inst.* 1.22.9). There is similar uncertainty surrounding her nature and divine functions, although Labeo states that she was an earth goddess (Macr. *Sat.* 1.12.21 ff.) and the idea of a goddess of generosity and fertility fits in well with the agricultural deities with which she is identified (Damia; Maia, a divinity symbolizing the fertility of the earth in spring; Proserpina; etc.) and with the titles *Bona* and *Ops*. She had a temple on the Aventine at the foot of the *saxum*—hence her epithet *Subsaxana* (cf. Platner-Asbhy, p. 85)—which men were strictly prohibited from entering (Ov. *Ars* 3.244; 637; *Fasti* 5.147 ff.). Her official festival was celebrated annually on the night of 4th–5th December (Wiseman, *op. cit.*, p. 130) in the house of a *magistratus cum imperio*, under the

direction of his wife or mother, and attended by the Vestal Virgins (Cic. *Att.* 1.12.3; *Har.* 37; *Leg.* 2.21; Plu. *Caes.* 9; *Cic.* 19). All men were expelled from the house; the presence of Clodius dressed up as a female flautist sparked off a notorious scandal in the year 62 BC (Plut. *Cic.* 28). Sacrilege of this kind was punished with loss of sight (Cic. *Domo.* 105; *Har.* 37; 38). Little is known of the ritual, except that a sacrifice was held on behalf of the people, *pro populo* (Cic. *Att.* 1.12.3; 1.13.3; D. C. 37.35.4), the victim apparently being a sow (Macr. 1.12.23), and that the event was accompanied by music and wine (Plu. *Caes.* 9; *Mor.* 268e). This mysterious festival, in which men were not allowed to participate, eventually degenerated into an orgy. On the legend that Hercules, expelled from the rites of the *Bona Dea*, exacted his revenge by setting up the *Ara Maxima* with certain ceremonies which could not be attended by women, cf. Prop. 4.9. On the *Bona Dea*, see also Kern, *RE* 4.2054; Peter in Roscher I, pp. 943 ff.; Wissowa, *RuK*², pp. 216 ff.; Grimal, *Mitologia*, pp. 71–72; K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, München 1960, pp. 228 ff.; Radke 73.

sacra: normally in the plural to refer to "secret rites", "mystery cults"; cf. Nep. *Alc.* 4.3, *quod sacra violasset, reum fecerunt*; Ov. *Ars* 2.607, *praecipue Cytherea iubet sua sacra taceri*; in the singular in Hor. *Od.* 3.2.26, *qui Cereris sacrum vulgarit arcanae*; *OLD sacrum* 3c.

9–10: the poet exonerates himself from the crime of poisoning. In the hexameter Lygdamus focuses on the moment when poison is placed in another's cup; in the pentameter, the moment when the poisoned cup is offered to someone to drink from. There is a similar distinction between *infecit* and *dedit* in [Mosch.] 3.111 ff., τίς δὲ βροτὸς τοσσοῦτον ἀνάμερος, ὡς κεράσαι τοι ἢ δοῦναι λαλέοντι τὸ φάρμακον; Cic. *Phil.* 11.6 (of Domitius Appulus), *at hic nuper sororis filio infudit venenum, non dedit.* Note the daring hyperbaton /*nec mea* . . . /*dextera nec* . . ., which with the enjambement ensures that the pentameter holds together. As regards the text, there is a problem concerning the word that goes with *venena*. The traditional phrase *certa venena* of the complete mss. is in itself possible ("efficient poisons"; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 27.146, *certiores medicinae*; 30.95, *certa* . . . *medicina*; *i.a.*), though unusual in connection with poisons rather than medicines. Some editors therefore prefer to follow other isolated ms. readings. Thus, some (Broukhusius, Vulpius, Heyne-Wunderlich, De Golbéry, Luck) read *taetra venena* (following G², unus Statii, Scal. ex coni.); for the expression, cf. Lucr. 4.685; [Verg.] *Dir.* 23; Prop. 2.24.27. This would be a variant *metri causa* of the normal phrase *atra venena* (cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.37.28, *atrum* . . .

venenum; Verg. *Ge.* 2.130, *atra venena* [with Mynors 27]; *Aen.* 2.221; Ov. *Her.* 9.115; Mart. 9.2.6, *pulla venena*; for black in connection with death, cf. l. 5 *nigram* . . . *horam* [comm.]). Others (Lachmann, Dissen, Müller, Baehrens, Postgate, Cartault, Ponchont, Lenz, Lee, Tränkle), in the light of Prop. 2.17.14, (*iuvat*) *sumere et in nostras trita* (*taetra* Pg[2]) *venena manus*/, prefer the reading *trita* of the *Fragmentum Cuiacianum*, attested by Scaliger. On the crushing of poison, cf. Pl. *Phd.* 117 a, ὁ παῖς . . . ἧκεν ἄγων τὸν μέλλοντα δώσειν τὸ φάρμακον, ἐν κύλικι φέροντα τετριμμένον; Ov. *Am.* 2.2.64–65, *non ad miscenda coimus* / *toxica*; *Ars.* 3.465, (*illa potest*) *dare mixta viro tritis aconita cicutis*; *Met.* 4.504, *omnia* (scil. *venena*, cf. l. 500) *trita*; 14.43–44, (*Circe*) *horrendis infamia pabula sucis* / *conterit et tritis Hecateïa carmina miscet*; *Ponto* 2.9.68, *mixtave sunt nostra dira venena manu*. The reading *trita* seems preferable, since both *certa* and *taetra* point to the efficacy of the poison, which would be redundant with the *mortiferis* . . . *sucis* of the hexameter.

9 mortiferis . . . sucis: technical periphrasis for *venenis*, parallel to *sucos* . . . *salubris* (Manil. 3.144). The poetic use of the adjective *mortifer*[*us*] (ie *mortem afferens*), though found in all periods of Latin, is certainly rare: Enn. *Scen.* 314, *mortiferum bellum*; Lucr. 6.819, *mortiferam vim*; 1091, *mortiferam cladem*; 1138; Lucil. 802 M, *mortifero vulnere*, Hor. 0; Verg. *Aen.* 6.279, *mortiferum* . . . *bellum*; Tib. 0; Prop. 3.13.17, *mortifero* . . . *lecto* (the only occurrence 'latiore sensu', ie *ad mortem pertinens*, *funebris*; cf. Fedeli *Prop.* III 425–426); Ov. *Rem.* 26, *sed tua mortifero sanguine tela carent*; *Ponto* 3.1.26, *tinctaque mortifera tabe sagitta madet*; in Silver Latin, Sen. *Ag.* 887; *Med.* 688; 717; 731; *Oed.* 555; Juv. 4.113; 9.95; Manil. 4.110; Col. *Rust.* 6.171; Sil. 10.142; cf. also Auson. *Mos.* 266; Claud. *Pros.* 3.237, *nosse nec aurigam licuit: seu mortifer ille seu Mors ipsa fuit*; Drac. *Orest.* 813; Maxim. 5.120; cf. *ThLL* 8.1517.72 ff. For this type of compound in *-fer* or *-ger*, see Barratt 128 *ad* Luc. *Civ.* 5.402; A. Grenier, *Étude sur la Formation et l'Emploi des Composés Nominaux dans le Latin Archaïque* (Nancy 1912) 120–121; G. Puccioni, "L'Uso stilistico dei Composti Nominali Latini", *Atti Accad. d'Italia*, Serie VII, 4, Fasc. 10 (Roma 1944) 427; J. C. Arens, "*-Fer* and *-Ger*. Their Extraordinary Preponderance among Compounds in Roman Poetry", *Mnemosyne* 3 (1950) 241–262; H. Tränkle, *Die Sprachkunst des Properz* (1960, *Hermes*, Einzelschr. 15) 58–59. As for *sucus*, its poetic use in connection with poisons and magic potions goes back to Ovid and the evil tricks of the *magae* Medea and Circe; cf. *Her.* 12 (*Medea Iasoni*).181, *sucus* . . . *veneni*; *Met.* 7.152, *Lethaei gramine suci* (= the potion which Medea gave Jason to induce sleep in the dragon guarding the

golden fleece); 215–216, *nunc opus est sucis, per quos renovata senectus / in florem redat primosque reconligat annos* (the potion with which Medea rejuvenated Aeson; cf. also ll. 265 and 287); 316; 13.941, *sucus . . . herbae*; 14.43–44, (*Circe*) *horrendis infamia pabula sucis / conterit*; 275–276, (*Circe*) *sucos / adicit*; 299, *spargimur ignotae sucis melioribus herbae*; cf. also Plin. *Nat.* 20.131, *cicutae suco exstinguitur* [*sucus rutae*]*: adeo etiam venenorum venena sunt.*

infecit pocula: for the expression, cf. Verg. *Ge.* 2.128, *pocula si quando saevae infecere novercae.*

infecit: for the predominantly poetic use of *inficere* in the sense of "to poison", cf. Verg. *Ge.* 2.128 (*supra cit.*); 3.481, *infecit pabula tabo*; *Aen.* 7.341, *Gorgoneis Allecto infecta venenis*; Ov. *Met.* 2.784, *infice tabe tua*; 3.76; 7.548; 13.601–602; Luc. *Civ.* 7.769, *infectum . . . aera . . . manibus*; *OLD inficio* 4a; *ThLL* 7.1.1413.42 ff.

pocula: a term frequently used in connection with magic philtres (particularly love potions), poisons and drugs in general; cf. Cic. *Clu.* 31, *exhausto illo poculo mortis*; Hor. *Epod.* 5.38, *amoris . . . poculum*; 17.80, *desideri . . . pocula*; Tib. 1.5.50, (scil. *lena*) *tristia cum multo pocula felle bibat* (with Murgatroyd 179); Ov. *Met.* 14.276, *accipimus sacra data pocula dextra* (Ulysses' companions turned into swine by Circe's potions); OLD *poculum* 2a.

10 dextera: the right hand was the one that was shaken as a token of friendship and hospitality (cf. Liv. 1.1.8, *dextera data fidem . . . amicitiae sanxisse*). That the right hand should administer the poison is a note of cruelty: the *fides amicitiae* of the victim is being betrayed, or the sacred principles of hospitality violated (cf. Ov. *Met.* 14. 276 *sup. cit.*). For *dextera* in the sense of "criminal hand" as a recurring element in protests of innocence, cf. the commentary on ll. 7–14.

trita: according to statistics by Bömer (21 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 14.44) the verb *terere* is relatively frequent in poetry: Hor. 7, Verg. 12, Tib. 3, Prop. 14, Ov. 27 (*Met.* 7), Lygd. 1; less so the compound *conterere*: Hor. 0, Verg. 0, Tib. 0, Prop. 3, Lygd. 0, Ov. 5 (*Met.* 1).

11: the line has come down to us completely disfigured and with widely-differing readings. The content of the distich, however, is clear: the *sacrilegium* committed in relation to a temple. The solution depends on the last two words in the line. There are four possibilities: 1) *sacrilegi . . . amovimus ignes* (Luck), sacrilegious theft of the Vestals' sacred fire. 2) *sacrilegi . . . amovimus aera* (Helm; cf. *PhW.* 58 [1938] 890), sacrilegious theft of the sacred objects of the temple. These two interpretations run up against the difficulty that, although the use of

amovere in connection with theft is fairly common in the legal literature of the Imperial period (cf. Gai. *Inst.* 3.195; Ulp. *Dig.* 15.1.3; 29.2.11.2; *i.a.*), it is quite rare outside this field, even in prose, and the present case would be the only clear occurrence in poetry (cf. however Verg. *Aen.* 6.524, *coniunx arma omnia tectis amovet* [*emovet* F[1]R: *Et movet* P[1]], although this is the only attested use of *amovere* in Virgil [with Norden *Aen.* 268]). 3) *sacrilegi* . . . *amovimus aegros*, the sacrilege of driving from the temples the sick who go there to pray for health. This reading, present in a not inconsiderable number of mss., has enjoyed certain favour since Cartault (Pichard, Calonghi, Lenz-Galinsky; Schuster, *Tibull-Studien* [1968] 157–160). 4) The humanist reading *sacrilegi* (*sacrilegos*) . . . *admovimus ignes*, the sacrilege of setting fire to temples, is therefore the most widely accepted among commentators from Muretus to the present (Lee, Tränkle); cf. Ov. *Met.* 14.539, *irrita sacrilega iactas incendia vestra*; Liv. 6.33.5 (on the burning of the city of *Setricum* and the temple of *Mater Matuta* by the Latins), *eos nec sua religio nec verecundia deum arcuisse dicitur sed vox horrenda edita templo cum tristibus minis ni nefandos ignes procul delubris amovissent.* Moreover, it is known that the burning of a temple was regarded as the most extreme of impious actions (cf. Stat. *Theb.* 5.683 ff.; [Quint.] *Decl. mai.* 11.7). Note the similarity between the text of Lygdamus and Encolpius' prayer to Priapus in Petr. *Satyr.* 133.3 l. 6 ff., *et timidas admitte preces. non sanguine tristi perfusus venio, non templis impius hostis admovi dextram, sed inops et rebus egenis attritus facinus non toto corpore feci.* As in Lygdamus, it is also a protestation of innocence. The reading *sacrilegi* . . . *ergo* (Scaliger) is scarcely plausible. The conjecture by Koenen *admovimus ungues* (*ICS* 1 [1976] 129 n. 11), based on the *dextram* of the parallel text of Petronius is unnecessary, as the allusion to the criminal hand, recurrent in formulas of this kind, already appeared in l. 10. A clear example of a "sacrilegious" fire is Ov. *Met.* 14.539 (Cybele to Turnus), *sacrilega iactas incendia dextra*: Turnus is attempting to burn the Trojan ships, built with pinewood cut from the peak of Mt. Ida; it should be recalled that Cybele is the «great mother of Ida»; consequently the sacred mother of the gods calls the Rutulian leader "sacrilegious".

sacrilegi: except for Ovid, there is no more than token use of this adjective in poetry: Verg. 1; Hor. 1; Tib. 1; Prop. 1; Ov. 9 (with statistics by Bömer 180 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 14.539).

admovimus ignes: the formula *admovere ignes* (or *ignem*) to denote the action of "setting fire", is common in Roman literature from

Quadr. *Frg.* 81 P., *ignem admovit*; cf. Quint. *Decl. min.* 323.5, (*Alexander*) *ignem sacris postibus* ... *admovere ausus est*; in poetry, cf. Ov. *Met.* 8.461, *positis* (*fragminibus*) *inimicos admovet ignes*/.

12: there is no crime that troubles his conscience. This pentameter seems to serve as an exoneration from any crime of action, by way of summing up those mentioned in the previous lines, as opposed to the verbal offences of the following distich.

cor: taken here as the seat of "conscience" (*sedes curae*); cf. *ThLL* 4.934.31 ff.

sollicitant: the poetic use of *sollicitare* with the meaning of "to distress" and an abstract subject is post-classical (cf. Ov. *Tr.* 4.8.6; Sen. *Phaed.* 438, *anxiam me cura sollicitat tui*; Luc. *Civ.* 6.806; Mart. 7.54.2, *somnia narras, quae moveant animum sollicitentque meum.* On remorse, Juvenal stated: *nam se iudice nemo nocens absolvitur*; Cicero, for his part: *sua quemque fraus, suum facinus, suum scelus, sua audacia de sanitate ac mente deturbat* (*Pis.* 46).

facta nefanda: ie *crimina*. The 'iunctura' is Ovidian; cf. Ov. *Her.* 14.16; *Fasti* 2.850; then only in late Latin (cf. *Pass. Petri et Pauli* I 124 p. 126; Waltharius 1081; Schumann, *LHL* II, p. 213). For parallel 'iuncturae', cf. Catul. 23.10, *non facta impia, non dolos veneni* Cato *Orat.* 61, *nefarium facinus*; [Caes.] *Hisp.* 15.6, *nefandum* ... *facinus*. The precedents in Ovid render unnecessary Baehrens' conjecture *furta nefanda* (cf. Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.93, *furtum nefarium*).

13–14: exoneration from the crime of βλασφημεῖν εἰς θεούς. This is one of the most frequently-mentioned religious offences in poetry from Hom. *Il.* 24.607–608 (blasphemy of Niobe against Leto); cf. Tib. 1.2.81–82; 3.52; 2.6.17–18; [Tib.] 3.10[= 4.4].14; Prop. 2.28.9–14; Lygd. 4.16. As regards the text, the traditional reading *insanae* ... *mentis* is replaced in the earliest editions by the humanist emendation *insanae* ... *linguae*. However, this conjecture is redundant in view of the content of the pentameter. Consequently, most modern editors accept the traditional reading. The only innovation comes from Luck, who introduces into his text the perceptive conjecture of Lipsius, *insana* ... *mente*, which was followed early on by Broukhusius and Vulpius but then forgotten (cf. Tib. 2.6.18, *insana mente nefanda loqui*). For the formulation of the hexameter, in addition to the previous passage of Tibullus cited, cf. Prop. 1.3.18, *iurgia saevitiae*; for the whole distich, Ov. *Met.* 3.261, *tum linguam ad iurgia solvit.* Note too the studied distribution of adjectives and nouns (ab-AB) within the pentameter.

13 meditantes: the use of the verb *meditari* in the sense of "to

plan, design an action" is an old one; cf. Pl. *Ps.* 941, *meditati sunt mihi doli docte*; Cic. *Cat.* 1.22, *fugam meditere*; *Nat.* 3.71, *scelera meditantes*; *Phil.* 11.3, *supplicia meditatur*; *Tusc.* 4.77, *meditatur poenam in fratrem novam*; Tac. *Ann.* 14.1, *diu meditatum scelus*. However, its use in elevated poetry is characteristic of Virgil (cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 5.61, *nec lupus insidias pecori, nec retia cervis ulla dolum meditantur*; *Ge.* 3.153, *Inachiae Iuno pestem meditata iuvencae*; *Aen.* 4.171, *nec iam furtivum Dido meditatur amorem*); cf. *ThLL* 8.577.9 ff.

iurgia: *maledicta* vel *iniuriae*. The use of the term *iurgium* in elevated poetry goes back to Verg. *Ecl.* 5.11, with the added peculiarity that it is not attested 'in poesi dactyl. nonnisi forma *iurgia*' (*ThLL* 7.2.665.58–59); cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 10.95; 11.406; Prop. 1.3.18; Ov. *Rem.* 35; *Met.* 3.261; *ThLL* 7.2.666.44 ff. What is new, however, is its use to denote recrimination directed at the gods. Normal practice in elegy is that it denotes the reproaches of the offended lover (cf. Pichon, p. 178).

14 impia . . . ora: expression modelled on the phrase *impia lingua* (Tib. 1.2.80; Lygd. 4,16); cf. also Tib. 1.3.52, *dicta in sanctos impia verba deos.*

adversos . . . deos/: "hostile, unfavourable gods". For the combination, cf. Scip. Mai. *ap.* Gell. 4.18.3, *non igitur simus adversos deos ingrati* (= Malcovati *ORF*[3] 3 [p. 8]); Cic. *Nat.* 1.4, *pietate adversos deos sublata*; Prop. 1.1.8, *adversos cogor habere deos/* (in the same place in the pentameter); Liv. 9.1.11, *adversis agant diis*; Ov. *Her.* 7.4, *adverso movimus ista deo*; *Ponto* 3.2.18, *adversos extimuere deos*; Curt. 4.10.6; 5.9.4; Juv. 10.129; Tac. *Ann.* 2.15, *adversis dis*; Flor. *Epit.* 1.46.2; *OLD adversus* 9c; *ThLL* 1.870.12 ff. Luck, following a conjecture proposed by Broukhusius and accepted by Vulpius, prefers to read *aversos . . . deos* (cf. Prop. 1.1.8, *aversos* (Heinsius) . . . *deos*; 4.1.74, *aversus Apollo*; Ov. *Am.* 3.12.17; Lygd. 3.28 [comm.]).

solvimus ora: the expression *ora solvere* ("to open the mouth") is used by poets from Ovid onwards only to refer to the action of "speaking" or "starting to speak"; cf. *Met.* 1.181, (*Iuppiter*) *talibus inde modis ora indignantia solvit* (with Bömer 82); 7.190–191; 9.427–428, *Iuppiter ora / solvit et . . . dixit*; 15.73–74, (*Pythagoras*) *primus quoque talibus ora / docta quidem solvit, sed non et credita, verbis* (with Bömer 277); *Tr.* 3.11.20; *Ponto* 2.5.53; Luc. *Civ.* 5.98–99, *oraque vatis / solvit* (with Barratt 35); 140; Sen. *Her. O.* 724; Sil. 15.455 *cum dulcia solverat ora*; 17.339; Stat. *Ach.* 1.524; (*ThLL* 9.2.1079.25–29); cf. also the variant *lingua solvere* in Ov. *Met.* 3.261, *linguam ad iurgia solvit*; Luc. *Civ.* 1.472, (*Fama*)

innumeras solvit falsa in preconia linguas. On the other hand, the parallel formula *ora resolvere* is already found in Verg. *Ge.* 4.452; cf. also *Aen.* 3.457; Ov. *Met.* 13.126–127 (with Bömer 237); *Fasti* 1.255; 6.249; *Ponto* 1.2.102; Luc. *Civ.* 7.609; 8.261; Sil. 16.603; Stat. *Theb.* 8.90; Arat. *Act.* 2.367 (*ThLL* 9.2.1079.18–20). Another possible poetic variant, the formula *os/ora aperire*, which is also of epic origin, was less widely used; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.247; Ov. *Met.* 15.557 (with Bömer 401); Apul. *Apol.* 8.2 (*maledictis*); *ThLL* 9.2.1079.21–24; cf. also the variant *hiscere* in Ov. *Met.* 13.231, *nec Telamoniades etiamnunc hiscere quicquam / audet.*

15–20: these distichs have the same function as ll. 7–14, namely, that of establishing the grounds for the plea for indulgence made by Lygdamus in l. 6: not only has he committed no serious crime, but in addition—'altera causa'—he is still too young to die. The passage shows a close dependence on Ovid, as is made clear by the following correspondences: l. 16 = *Ars* 2.670; ll. 17–18 = *Tr.* 4.10.5–6; ll. 19–20 = *Am.* 2.14.23–24; cf. A. G. Lee, "The Date of Lygdamus and his Relationship to Ovidius", *PCPhS* (1958–1959) 17; Axelson, "Lygd. & Ov.", pp. 95–99; "Geburtsjahr", p. 282.

ora: poetic plural; see Lygd. 4.87 *terga* (comm.).

15–16: vindication of his youthfulness by means of the negation of two of the characteristic traits of *damnosa senectus*, grey hair and walking slowly with a stoop. In contrast, there is no mention here of wrinkles, though they are featured below (*rugosa* . . . *senecta*, l. 25); for a picture of the symptoms of old age, cf. Ov. *Met.* 3.275–278, (*Iuno*) *simulavit anum posuitque ad tempora canos / sulcavit cutem rugis et curva trementi / membra tulit passu, vocem quoque fecit anilem / ipsa que erat Beroë, Semeles Epidauria nutrix.*

15: the characteristically Lygdamean colour contrast, between white (old age) and black (youth), has precedents which may well have served as models in Prop. 3.5.24, *sparserit et nigras alba senecta comas*; Ov. *Tr.* 4.8.2, *inficit et nigras alba senecta comas*. For the image encapsulated in this line, cf. also Tib. 1.8.42, *cum vetus infecit cana senecta caput*; 2.2.20, *dum tarda senectus / inducat rugas inficiatque comas*; for grey hair as a symbol of old age, cf. also Anacr. 13; 50.1–4; 75 P; Catul. 61.161–163, *usque dum tremulum movens / **cana** tempus **anilitas** / omnia omnibus annuit*; 108.1, *cana senectus*; Ov. *Ars* 2.117, *et tibi iam veniet cani, formose, capilli*; *Tr.* 4.10.93–94, *iam mihi canities, pulsis melioribus annis, / venerat, antiquas miscueratque comas.*

cani: scil. *capilli cani*; the substantivization is first attested in prose

in Cic. *Senect.* 62, *non cani nec rugae repente auctoritatem arripere possunt* (thereafter only in Sen. *Dial.* 10.7.10; Plin. *Nat.* 21.44); in poetry first in Tib. 1.10.43, *liceatque caput candescere canis*; nine times in Ovid: *Met.* 8 (eg 3.275; 516, *albentia tempora canis*; 6.26; 8.9, *inter honoratos . . . canos*; 568, *raris iam sparsus tempora canis*; 14.655) + *Ponto* 1.4.1–2, *iam mihi deterior canis adspergitur aetas / iamque meos vultus ruga senilis arat*; cf. also [Verg.] *Cir.* 320, *candentis . . . canos* (with Lyne 236); Sen. *Her. f.* 1248–1249, *perque venerandos piis / canos, senectae parce desertae, precor*; Luc. *Civ.* 2.375; 5.274–275, *iam respice canos / invalidasque manus et inanis cerne lacertos* (with Barratt 89); 7.371–372; *AP* 5.76.3, ἠλλάχθη δὲ χρόνῳ καὶ γήραϊ καὶ πολιαῖσι. The metonymic nominalization *cani* = *senecta* ("grey hair" = "old age") is post-classical; cf. Col. *Rust.* 12.59.5; Pers. 5.65; Apul. *Met.* 8.20.

laesere: in connection with beauty and youth, *laedere* is used of anything which disfigures; cf. [Tib.] 3.9[= 4.3].8, *teneras laedere . . . manus*; Ov. *Am.* 1.7.40, *laesae . . . genae*; 10.14, *nunc mentis vitio laesa figura tua est*; 14.39, *non te* (ie *tuam figuram*) *cantatae laeserunt paelicis herbae*; *Ars* 3.207, *hinc quoque praesidium laesae petitote figurae* (*medicamina formae* 205); Mart. 12.54, *brevis pede, lumine laesus*; *ThLL* 7.2.867.68–71; cf. Pichon, p. 182. In the light of the *loci similes*, it can be concluded that this sense of *laedere* is typically Ovidian. Moreover, there is even an occurrence in Ovid of this use of *laedere* in connection with change in colour which may be considered the model for Lygdamus; cf. Ov. *Ars* 3.703, *palluit, ut serae, lectis de vite racemis, / pallescunt frondes, quas nova laesit hiems* (note also the frequent simile head/treetop or hair/leaves; cf. eg Ov. *Ars* 3.38).

On the poetic use of the perfect forms in *-ere* and *-erunt*, see the commentary on Lygd. 1.1 *venere.*

capillos: on terms for "hair" in Roman poetry, see the commentary on Lygd. 1.10 *comas.*

16: for the formulation Lygdamus has made use of a line of Ovid: *iam veniet tacito curva senecta pede/* (*Ars* 2.670). Observe, however, the subtle differences with regard to his model: 1) the prospective future *iam veniet* is replaced by *nec venit*; 2) *tardo . . . pede*, unlike Ovid's *tacito . . . pede*, is an ablative of quality dependent on *curva senecta*, not on *venit*; 3) the replacement of the adjective *tacito* by *tardo*. All these modifications reveal a skilful manipulation of the borrowing from Ovid, with differing ends. Ovid, faithful as ever to the Horatian *carpe diem* commonplace, was interested in emphasizing how stealthily old age creeps into our lives; hence the adjective *tacitus* and its direct influence on the verb.

The formulation is repeated in other works of Ovid (cf. Ov. *Tr.* 3.7.35–36, *inicietque manum formae damnosa senectus / quae* ***strepitus passu non faciente*** *venit*, with the alliteration of **s** suggesting silence (onomatopoeia); 4.6.17, ***tacito pede*** *lapsa vetustas*; 10.27, *tacito passu labentibus annis*), although it should be noted that Ovid for his part is exploiting a Tibullan formula; cf. Tib. 1.10.34, (*atra mors*) *imminet et* ***tacito*** *clam venit illa* ***pede***; cf. also 1.9.4, *sera tamen tacitis Poena venit pedibus*. In Lygdamus the reference is merely one to the poet's "youthfulness", with the obstacles of old age still far ahead. Consequently, *tacito* is replaced by another adjective commonly used to refer to old age (*tardus*), which alludes to the slow, laborious walk of the elderly, as in Tib. 2.2.19–20, *dum tarda senectus inducat rugas inficiatque comas*. It is not the imminent surreptitious arrival of old age that is of interest here, but the physical difficulties inherent in this stage of life, as stressed by Ovid himself in *Met.* 14.142–143 (the Cumaean Sibyl), *iam felicior aetas / terga dedit, tremuloque gradu venit aegra senectus* (a similar youth/old age opposition). It would make no sense to take *tardo pede* with *venit*, since no explanation is given as to why old age is to come "with a slow gait"; cf. Dissen 366: "cave iungas *venit tardo pede*"; B. Axelson, "Lygdamus und Ovid", *Eranos* 58 (1960) 95. The expression *tarda senectus* (or *senecta*) dates back to Enn. *Scen.* 348, *tarda in senectute*; cf. also Lucr. 1.414; Verg. *Aen.* 5.395, *tardante senecta*; 8.508, *sed mihi tarda gelu saeclisque effeta senectus*; 9.610, *nec tarda senectus debilitat viris animi*; Hor. *Sat.* 2.2.88; Tib. 2.2.19 *sup. cit.*; Ov. *Met.* 12.182, *quamvis obstet mihi tarda vetustas*; *Tr.* 4.8.23, *tarda vires minuente senecta*; Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.156, *tarda situ rebusque exhausta senectus* (cf. also Ov. *Met.* 7.478, *tardus gravitate senili* [with Bömer 321–322]; 8.686, *tardos aetate*); the variant *pigra senecta* in Tib. 1.10.40; Ov. *Met.* 10.396. For the phrase *tardo . . . pede*, an ironic twisting of the well-established formula *cito pede* (cf. Ov. *Ars* 3.65, *cito pede labitur aetas*), cf. Acc. *Trag.* 183, *tardo procedens gradu*. Note the studied distribution of adjectives and nouns in this line (abBA).

curva senecta: an Ovidian expression (*Ars* 2.670). The poetic use of the adjective *curvus* in connection with extreme old age is first found in Propertius (2.18.20, *cum sis ipsa* ***anus*** *haud longa* ***curva*** *futura die*). Ovid used this to shape the concrete image of *curva senecta* (*Ars* 2.670); cf. *Met.* 9.434–435, *me* (= *Iovem*) *quoque fata regunt, qua si mutare valerem, / nec nostrum seri* ***curvarent*** *Aeacon anni*; 14.659, *anus . . . incurva*. In *Met.* 3.276–277, (*anus*) *curva trementi / membra tulit passu*, Ovid follows the Propertian line more closely (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.34, *curvata senio*

membra); for the subsequent fate of this Ovidian expression, see also *CLE* 509.2 (cited by Fletcher 50); 2075.1–2, *vive deo, dum fata sinunt, nam curva senectus / te rapit et Ditis ianua nigra vocat* (= *ILCV* 2211.1–2). However, old age in its initial stages is not necessarily "stooped" (cf. Juv. *Sat.* 3.26–28, *dum nova canities, dum prima et* **recta** *senectus, / dum superest Lachesi quod torqueat, et pedibus me / porto meis, nullo dextram subeunte bacillo / . . .*); *curva* therefore applies to the later stages of old age, when death is near.

For Ovid's practice of applying adjectives to old age, apart from the *tarda senecta* and *pigra senecta* studied in the previous section, cf. also *damnosa senectus* in Ov. *Met. Tr.* 3.7.35; *annosa senecta* (*senectus*) in Ov. *Met.* 7.237; 13.517; *aegra senectus* in Ov. *Met.* 14.143 (with Bömer 59); [Ambr.] *Trin.* (*MGH auct. ant.* 15.381) 12; Lact. *Phoen.* 15 *CSEL* 27 p. 136; *AL* 481.208; 804.13 R.; *occidua senecta* (*senectus*) in Ov. *Met.* 15.227 (with Bömer 316); Apul. *Apol.* 36 p. 477 Oud. (= 41.19 Helm); Donat. *Aen.* 10.515 p. 359.14 Georgii, *occidua aetate*; *ThLL* 9.2.354.30 ff.; *orba senecta* in Ov. *Ars* 2.271; *Met.* 5.27; *cariosa senecta* in Ov. *Am.* 1.12.29; *cana senecta* in Ov. *Her.* 14.109 (cf. Prop. 3.5.24, *alba senecta*); cf. also *tristisque senectus* in Verg. *Ge.* 3.67; *Aen.* 6.275; *orba senectus* in Auson. 362.44 p. 89 Peiper (= 94 Prete).

senecta: for the word-pair forms *senecta/senectus*, see Lygd. 3.8 (comm.).

17–18: on this *locus valde disputatus*, see the first chapter of the introduction on the *Quaestio Lygdamea*, which originates in this distich.

17 primo: this use of the adverb *primo* as equivalent to *primum* is not very common, but is also found in Ovid; cf. eg Ov. *Met.* 15.106 (with Bömer 285); *Ponto* 3.6.45 (in the same place in the hexameter); cf. W. Erath, *Die Dichtung des Lygdamus*, Diss. Erlangen, 1971, p. 464 n. 1. On this *primo*, pleonasm or not, see Introduction, footnote 36.

videre: on the poetic use of the perfect forms in *-ere* and *-erunt*, see the commentary on Lygd. 1.1 *venere*.

18 cecidit fato: for the expression, apart from Ov. *Tr.* 4.10.6, cf. Ov. *Tr.* 1.2.53, *fatoque suo ferroque cadentem*; Sen. *Oed.* 780, *regio fato*; 787; Tac. *Ann.* 1.55, *fato et vi Armini.*

uterque pari: a clearly Ovidian pentameter-ending; cf. Ov. *Fasti* 5.704, *suadet, et ex causa pugnat uterque pari/*; *Her.* 1.114, *incitat et morsus error uterque pares/*.

19–20: rhetorical question on the pointlessness of an early death using the metaphor of fruit picked before ripening. Once again, we have a borrowing from Ovid (*Am.* 2.14.23–24):

Quid plenam fraudas vitem crescentibus uvis
pomaque crudeli vellis acerba manu?

And once again Lygdamus shows himself to be a poor adapter. In Ovid, where the metaphor refers to an abortion Corinna has undergone, the laden vine is the pregnant woman, the still unripened grapes and the bitter fruit the aborted child. In Lygdamus, however, there is no clear term of comparison to which the vine can be related, since the idea of the tree of life from which human beings hang like fruit is not familiar to the Roman poets. Moreover, the changes introduced by Lygdamus, forced no doubt both by the conversion of Ovid's real question (*quid fraudas?*) into a rhetorical one (*quid fraudare iuvat?*) and by a wish to avoid the patchwork, centoesque impression that would be produced by a second literal quote from Ovid, hard on the first, is somewhat infelicitous, especially in the remodelling of the pentameter. Thus, for instance, the inventive formulation *modo nata* (for *acerba*), though one no doubt moulded on *nata* (l. 25) and *nondum natis* (l. 28) in Ovid's poem, is an extremely exaggerated metaphor to refer to a *iuvenis*. The use of *mala* for *crudeli* may be inspired by Verg. *Ecl.* 3.11, *mala vitis incidere falce novellas*; cf. Axelson, "Lygd. & Ov.", pp. 96–97.

In addition, the comparison between early death and the picking of unripened fruit can be found in Cic. *Senect.* 71, *quasi poma ex arboribus, cruda si sunt, vix evelluntur, si matura et cocta, decidunt, sic vitam adulescentibus vis aufert, senibus maturitas.* Moreover, the same commonplace in connection with Pluto appears in a Greek funeral epigram from the imperial period found in Naples and dedicated to a seven-year-old boy, in which Pluto is asked why he picks unripe grapes: δακρυχαπὴς Πλούτων, οὐ πνεύματα πάντα βρότεια Σοὶ νέμαται; τί τρυγᾶς ὄμφακας ἡλικίης; (*IG* 14.769 = *Epigr. Gr.* 575.6 Kaibel = *Anthol. Gr.* t. II p. 791 Jacobs). For the conjoint reference to grapes and *poma* as *exempla*, apart from Ov. *Am.* 2.14.23–24 *sup. cit.*, cf. Tib. 1.1.7–8; Ov. *Am.* 1.10.55–56, *carpite de plenis pendentes vitibus uvas, / praebeat Alcinoi poma benignus ager* (with McKeown 303); 3.7.33–34.

19 fraudare: for *fraudare* in the sense of "to deprive someone or something *dolo malo* of what is theirs by right", cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.355, *Ascanius . . . quem regno Hesperiae defraudo*; Ov. *Am.* 1.13.17, *tu* (scil. *Aurora*) *pueros somno fraudas tradisque magistris*; *ThLL* 6.1.1262.78 ff. In connection with fruit (cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.14.23), the poetic use of this verb can be understood in that the fruit belongs by right to the tree until it ripens and falls. For a use of this verb in connection with *mors immatura*,

cf. Mart. 7.40.5, *occidit illa prior viridi fraudata iuventa.* Nor should we ignore Ov. *Met.* 7.250, where Medea beseeches the *dei inferi* "to be in no haste to remove (*fraudare*) from that body (= of Aeson) its aged soul". The verb *fraudare* is found mainly in prose. Its use in poetry is mainly confined to Ovid: Ov. 10 (*Am.* 1.13.17; 2.14.23; *Her.* 6.163; *Ars* 3.293; *Met.* 7.250 [with Bömer 268]; 654 [with Bömer 363]; 10.196; 14.715; *Fasti* 3.829; 6.132); Verg. 1 (*Aen.* 4.355 *sup. cit.*); Verg. *Cir.* 1 (l. 83); Hor. 1 (*Sat.* 1.6.124); Tib. 0; Prop. 0; Pers. 0; Juv. 0; Mart. 7 (2.46.9; 8.59.11; 10.18.1; as a past participle in agreement with a noun, in 7.25.5; 40.5; 10.50.5; 14.162.1). The construction of *fraudare* with the ablative is found from Cicero onwards; cf. Hofmann-Szantyr 106 (§ 74). The Lygdamean construction *fraudare* + *aliquem vel aliquid* + *aliquo* is only found before Ovid in Cic. *Fin.* 5.91, *cetera . . . fraudare suo vetere nomine*; in Ovid three times (*Am.* 2.14.23; *Ars* 3.293; *Met.* 7.654); then also in Liv. 2.61.9 and Lygdamus. The construction of *fraudare* with double accusative is not found before Ulpianus (cf. *ThLL* 6.1263.80; Hofmann-Szantyr 43 [§ 48 a]).

crescentibus uvis: ie *immites uvae.* The image of bitter grapes as a symbol of immaturity is found not only in connection with *mors immatura*, but also in erotic contexts, where it refers to immature young women, not yet ready for love and marriage; cf. *AP* 5.19 (Honest.); 12.205 (Strat.); *JRS* 18.30 (Tembris); Nisbet-Hubbard 84–85 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 2.5.10, *tolle cupidinem immitis uvae.* For *crescentibus* in connection with the years of youth, cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.61, *seu caperis primis et adhuc crescentibus annis* (in the same place in the line).

20 modo nata: for *modo* in the sense of *nuper* ("recently"), cf. *ThLL* 8.1305.6 ff.; for its iambic shortening, cf. Lygd. 4.64 (comm.). For the phrase, cf. Cic. *Fin.* 2.31, *animal illud modo natum*; Ov. *Met.* 8.445; 11.732; Petr. *Satyr.* 82.3; 123.190; *ThLL* 8.1307.7–8.

mala . . . manu: ie *crudeli, nocente, perniciosa.* For the expression, cf. Pl. *Amph.* 605, *huic homini nescio quid est mali mala obiectum manu, postquam a me abiit*; *Persa* 313; Petr. *Satyr.* 63.7, *illum tetigerat mala manus*; Stat. *Theb.* 11.650, *maligna . . . manu*; Calp. Sic. 3.73, *mala . . . bracchia*; *CIL* 6.18817.8 (*a coniuge*) *a mala manu diseparati sumus*; *ThLL* 8.350.48–51. For *malus* describing as "evil" the action of cutting still-young vines, cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 3.11, *mala vitis incidere falce novellas.*

vellere: "to pluck". The verb is not very frequent in the Augustan poets, and is normally used in connection with hair: Hor. 3 (*Sat.* 1.9.63; 1.3.133; *Ep.* 2.1.46); Verg. 12 (*Ecl.* 6.4; *Ge.* 4.108; *Aen.* 3.27; 8.650; 9.506; 10.381; 888; 11.19; 566; 724; *Copa* 38; *Mo.* 91);

Prop. 3 (3.15.13; 25.13; 4.8.23); Tib. 0; Ov. 5 (*Am.* 2.14.24; 3.15.16; *Ars* 1.606; *Met.* 8.800; *Hal.* 17).

poma: the term *pomum* (or *pomus*) can denote both the fruit-tree (cf. Cato *Agr.* 133.1, *propagatio pomorum ceterarumque arborum*; in poetry Lucr. 5.1377; Verg. *Ge.* 2.426; Tib. 1.1.8; 2.1.43; Ov. *Met.* 13.719; Col. *Arb.* 19.1), and—as here—the fruit itself, but always from a tree, never from a bush (cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 9.50, *insere, Daphni, piros: carpent tua poma nepotes*), especially the apple (cf. Cels. 2.18.6, *ex fructibus sulcorum valentiores uvae, ficus, nuces . . . quam quae poma proprie nominantur*); cf. André, *Botanique*, pp. 257–258. The use of the more poetic *pōma*, instead of the metrically equivalent *māla*, no doubt arises from the presence of *mălа* in the same line, and avoids an awkward *paronomasia* (cf. Lausberg, *Retórica literaria*, p. 117 [§ 638 1b]); in 4.34, on the other hand, there is nothing to prevent Lygdamus from using *mala*.

21–22: once again Lygdamus pleads for compassion and clemency, although this time his entreaty is addressed to the *dei inferi* as a whole, and not only to Persephone, as was the case in l. 6 (*parcite* picks up *parce*). The construction of the relative clause, as far as the pentameter is concerned, is hotly debated. It all hinges on how we interpret *sortiti*. The most reasonable solution is to understand *estis*: "Take pity, all you gods who dwell by the gloomy waters / and to whom fell the inhospitable kingdoms, the third lot". Although such ellipses are much rarer in the 2nd (or the 1st) person than in the 3rd, and are also unparalleled in the 2nd member of copulative structures, there are nevertheless examples of both from the time of Augustus on (cf. on the one hand Verg. *Aen.* 5.191–192, *promite . . . nunc animos, quibus in Gaetulis Syrtibus usi*; Prop. 2.28.12; Luc. *Civ.* 1.141; 6.616; *i.a.*; on the other, Hor. *Od.* 4.15.13 ff.). The alternative, however, which is to take *sortiti* as a genitive agreeing with *dei* ("Take pity, all you who dwell by the gloomy waters / and the inhospitable kingdom of the god who was favoured with the third lot"), produces a notably harsh pentameter, in which *regna* carries a triple complementation.

21 parcite: answers to *parce* (l. 6). The imperatives *parce* and *parcite* are ritual forms characteristic of prayers to the gods (= φείδεο, φείδετε); cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.19.7–8, *Euhoe, parce Liber, parce* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 320); G. Appel, *De Romanorum precationibus* (1909) 120; Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford 1957) 411 n. 1. Their use in poetry can be considered characteristic of Tibullus: in the *Corp. Tib.* there are 18 occurrences of the verb *parco*, 15 of them in books I and II, of which 9 are in the

form *parce*, and 4 *parcite*, used by the poet basically to express an entreaty. In comparison, Virgil uses this verb 22 times, in 15 instances in the *Aeneid* (7 *parce*, 1 *parcite*); Lucan, who uses the verb 23 times, has *parce* only 5 times. Finally, it should be observed that *parcite* always constitutes—as it does here—the opening dactyl of the line (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 12.693; Tib. 1.1.34; 2.35; 6.51; 9.5), and that there is frequent alliteration of *p* (***parcite pallentes***) in the use of this verb (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.526, ***parce pio***; 3.42, ***parce, pias***; Tib. 1.1.34, ***parcite:*** *de magno* ***praeda petenda*** *grege*; 3.51, ***parce, pater***; 4.83, ***parce, puer***; 8.51, ***parce, precor*** [= Hor. *Od.* 4.1.2; Ov. *Her.* 16.11; Luc. *Civ.* 6.773; 7.540]); cf. J. Hellegouarc'h, "*Parce, precor* . . . ou Tibulle et la prière". Étude stylistique", *Illinois Classical Studies* 14 (1989) 65–67.

pallentes undas: cf. Lygd. 1.28, *pallida Ditis aqua* (comm.). For the association of the terms *pallor*, *pallidus*, *pallens* (and similar) with death, the dead and Hell (*pallida regna*), see Pease 109 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 4.26; Nisbet-Hubbard 67 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 1.4.13; Barratt 209 *ad* Luc. *Civ.* 5.628. Some early editors prefer to follow the reading *umbras* of certain mss., which fits in better with Hom. *Il.* 15.191, cited below (for the pallid inhabitants of the underworld, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.26; 242–243; 6.480; Stat. *Theb.* 2.48, *pallentes . . . umbras* [with Mulder 63]).

tenetis: "occupy", "inhabit"; for *tenere* fere i. q. *habere*, cf. Ov. *Met.* 2.376, *tenet os sine acumina rostrum*; 513, *pro me tenet altera caelum!*; 9.146, *thalamos tenet altera nostros*; *OLD teneo* 9.

22 duraque sortiti tertia regna dei: allusion to the distribution by lot of the empire of the Universe between Zeus, Poseidon and Hades, after the victory over their father Kronos and the Titans (cf. Hom. *Il.* 15.187–193). While Zeus obtained sovereignty over the vast Heavens and Poseidon over the boundless Sea, to Hades fell the thick darkness, that is, the lower world, Hell or Tartarus (cf. Hom. *Il.* 15.189 and 191, τριχθὰ δὲ πάντα δέδασται, ἕκαστο δ' ἔμμορε τιμῆς / . . . Ἀίδες δ' ἔλαχε ζόφον ἠερόεντα). As regards the formulation the closest parallel is Ov. *Fasti* 4.584, (scil. *Persephone*) *nupta Iovis fratri tertia regna tenet*; cf. also Ov. *Met.* 5.368, (*Pluto*) *cui triplicis cessit fortuna novissima regni*; Sen. *Her. f.* 609, *tertiae sortis loca* (cited by Fletcher 50); 833, *tertiae regem . . . sortis* [scil. *Ditem*]; *Phaed.* 1212, *regna me* (scil. *Theseum*) *norunt tria*; cf. also Stat. *Theb.* 8.38–39, *me* (scil. *Plutonem*) *tertia . . . deiecit fortuna polo*; Sil. 8.116; for similar references to the sea as *secundum* (*-a*) *regnum* (*-a*), cf. Sen. *Herc. f.* 599; *Phaed.* 904; *Med.* 598 (with Costa 122); Stat. *Silv.* 3.2.14 (with Laguna 204–205). Note how in *Tr.* 2.53 Ovid calls the *dei inferi* whom he is invoking *tertia numina*, and in *Am.*

3.8.50, when complaining about human avarice, he ironically asks *cur non et caelum tertia regna* (= *Inferna*) *facis?*

dura . . . regna: for the combination, Fletcher 50 cites Verg. *Aen.* 6.566, *durissima regna*; cf. also Hom. *Od.* 9.94, ἀτερπέα χῶρον; Verg. *Ge.* 4.479, *palus inamabilis*; Ov. *Met.* 10.15, *inamoena . . . regna* (with Bömer 19). On the grimness of Hell and the *dei inferi*, who implacably and unpityingly refuse to allow any of their subjects to return to the world of the living, cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 1.10, *inexorabiles iudices, Minos et Rhadamanthus*; Hor. *Od.* 1.24.15–18, *num vanae redeat sanguis imagini, / quam virga semel horrida, / non lenis precibus fata recludere, / nigro compulerit Mercurius gregi?* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 287–288); 2.3.24, *victima nil miserantis Orci*; 14.6–7, *inlacrimabilem / Plutona*; Verg. *Ge.* 4.489, (scil. *Eurydice*) *ignoscenda quidem, scirent si ignoscere manes*; 492, *immitis . . . tyranni* (scil. *Ditis*); Verg. *Aen.* 12.199, *duri . . . Ditis*; 816, *Stygii caput implacabile fontis*; Ov. *Met.* 10.76, *esse deos Erebi crudeles questus*; Sen. *Ag.* 752, *avidi . . . Ditis* (with Tarrant 312); Stat. *Silv.* 2.6.81, *durum . . . Acheronta*; 3.3.16, *rigidum . . . Aeacon* (with Laguna 263); 187, *aspera numina Lethes*; 193, *immitem . . . Styga*; 206, *immites . . . ad umbras.* The gods of the underworld are traditionally inexorable from Hom. *Il.* 9.158, Ἀΐδες τοι ἀμείλιχος ἠδ' ἀδάμαστος; *Orph. H.* 87.9 (to Thanatos), οὔτε γὰρ εὐχαῖσιν πείθῃ μόνος οὔτε λιταῖσιν; Peek, *GV* 971.3–4 = Kaibel, *EG* 345.3–4, μῆτερ ἐμή, θρήν[ων ἀ]ποπαύεο, λ[ῆ]ξον ὀδυρμῶν / κ[αὶ] κοπετῶν· Ἀίδης οἶκ[τ]ον ἀποστ[ρέφεται; *Carm. Epigr.* 1212.5–6; West 370 *ad* Hes. *Th.* 769–773 (δεινὸς . . . χύων).

sortiti: the word is found mainly in elevated style; only 6 times in Ovid, mainly in *Met.* (cf. 2.241 [with Bömer 302]; 3.124; 8.596; 9.493; 11.758; *Tr.* 1.6.21); it is clearly epic in tone (9 times in Verg.: *Ge.* 3.71; *Aen.* 2.18; 3.376; 3.510; 634; 5.756; 8.445; 9.174; 12.920; cf. also [Verg.] *Cir.* 397).

23–26: Lygdamus expresses his willingness to die when he is an old man. Note the warmer, more familiar treatment now accorded to death and old age, the latter now presented as venerable and longed-for. A notable contribution to this more pleasant view of death is made by the the allusion to the Elysian Fields, the abode of the Blest after death, a frequent consolation motif in tombstone inscriptions (cf. Lattimore, *Themes in Epitaphs* 40–42, 51–54) and in epicedia (J. Esteve Forriol, *Die Trauer- und Trostgedichte in der römischen Literatur*, Diss. München 1962, 147–148 § 52). Menander Rhetor recommends the happy picture of the dead man in Elysium as a topos of *consolatio* (414.16–19 with Russell-Wilson 326; 421.16–17), and an author as

strongly influenced by the rules of rhetoric as Statius follows his recommendations in the *Silvae*; cf. 2.1.194–207; 6.98–102; 3.3.22–26a (with Laguna 264–265); 5.1.253–257; 3.277–287. The two distichs hang well together because of the combination *olim* . . . *cum*, where the temporal clause with *cum* explains the adverb *olim*, "in another time, when". The use of this combination to refer to the future is only found in Ovid and sporadically in other poets of the 1st c. AD (eg Calp. Sic. 5.102). The progression *olim liceat* . . ., *cum senex* recalls the *ubi senecta* . . ., *tum mihi* . . . *libeat* of Prop. 3.5.23–25, and suggests the possible emendation of *liceat* to *libeat*, which would be more in keeping with Lygdamus' perfect willingness to die at a ripe old age. The unusual *cognoscere* may be an echo of the *perdiscere* of the Propertian passage, in which the poet works his way through an exhaustive catalogue of natural phenomena he would like to witness in his old age (ll. 25–46), though what we may have here is a parody of epic 'visits' to the underworld; cf. Ov. *Met.* 14.111–112, *Elysiasque domos et regna novissima mundi / me duce* (= *Sybilla*) **cognosces** *simulacraque cara parentis*. For *cognoscere* with reference to a place in the sense of *adire* or *visere*, cf. Prop. 1.6.13, *nec mihi sit tanti doctas cognoscere Athenas* (with Fedeli 176); Caes. *Gall.* 4.20.2, *si* . . . *loca portus aditus cognovisset*; Ov. *Her.* 21.67–68, *vel non mihi tempore in illo / esset in Aegaeis cognita Delos aquis*; *AL* 411.1 R., *quisquis Cecropias, hospes, cognoscis Athenas*. This usage is first attested in Ennius (*Ann.* 16 V.[2], *Lunai portum, est operae, cognoscite cives* [= *op. inc. frg.* 2 Sk.; Pers. *Sat.* 6.9]); but Ennius is probably calquing a usage already found in Pi. *O.* 13.3–4, γνώσομαι / τὰν ὀλβίαν Κόρινθον (in Liddell-Scott, γνώσομαι is attributed with the meaning of *celebrare*; cf., however, L. R. Farnell, *Pindar. A Commentary* [London 1932] 89). For the funerary use of *adire*, *visere* and similar verbs in the euphemistic periphrasis "to see or visit the underworld" for "to die", cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.533–534 (Deiphobus to Aeneas), *an quae te fortuna fatigat, / ut tristis sine sole domos, loca turbida, adires?*; [Verg.] *Cul.* 372–373, *Ditis opacos / cogor adire lacus*; Ov. *Met.* 14.125, *loca mortis adire* (with Bömer 55); 590–591 (Venus to Jupiter on her son Aeneas), *satis est inamabile regnum / aspexisse semel, Stygio, semel isse per amnes*; *Fasti* 3.620, *Tartareas domos*; 4.605, *Tartara*; Mart. 1.78.4, *decrevit Stygios Festus adire lacus*; 5.25.6, *quis Stygios non volt totus adire lacus?*; 93.2, *qui prior Elysias gaudet adisse domos*; *CLE* 422.2, *non dum Persephones sperabam visere regna*; *ThLL* 1.624.55 ff. s.v. *adire*.

23 Elysios . . . campos: the earliest Latin passage in which the term *campi Elysii* (Ἠλύσιον [πεδίον] in Hom. *Od.* 4.563) is used to

refer to the dwelling-place of the Blest after death is Verg. *Ge.* 1.38. However, Lygdamus' direct model would appear to be Tib. 1.3.58, *(me) ipsa Venus campos ducet in Elyseos*, since Lygdamus is thinking of a specific Elysium for poets in love, easily imaginable after the description by Tibullus (1.3.57–66); for the idea of lovers in Elysium, cf. also Prop. 4.7.59–62; [Verg.] *Cul.* 261 ff.; on the Tibullan Elysium and its characteristics, cf. Smith 253 ff.; W. Wimmel, *Der frühe Tibull*, Monaco 1968, pp. 203 ff.; A. A. R. Henderson, "Tibullus, Elysium and Tartarus", *Latomus* 28 (1969) 649–653. Lucianus (*VH* 2.19.25 ff.) places lovers on the Isles of the Blest; in Virgil those who died of cruel love inhabit the *Lugentes Campi* in Hell (*Aen.* 6.441 ff.). On the depiction of Elysium, cf. Hom. *Od.* 4.563–568: Proteus describes it to Menelaus as a *locus amoenus*, where the pleasant zephyr always blows and there is an eternal bright spring; Tib. 1.3.59–62; Prop. 4.7.60–62; Ov. *Am.* 2.6.49–50. Originally Elysium was the place where the gods' favourites went after death, kinship with the gods being a requisite for entrance (cf. especially Hom. *Od.* 4.561–569: Menelaus will go to Elysium since he is a son-in-law of Zeus); later, however, there arises the idea of Elysium as a reward for an honest life (cf. Pl. *Ax.* 371 C, ὅσοις μὲν οὖν ἐν τῷ ζῆν δαίμων ἀγαθὸς ἐπέπνευσεν, εἰς τὸν τῶν εὐσεβῶν οἰκίζονται; Verg. *Aen.* 6.660 ff.; Serv. *Aen.* 5.735; Val.-Flac. 1.843; 851); in the earliest versions Elysium was imagined as being on the earth, on the western edges of the world (cf. Hom. *Od.* 4.563–568; Hes. *Op.* 167 ff.; cf. Hor. *Epod.* 16.41–42), but later eschatology placed it 'in medio Inferorum', though as a separate part, quite distinct from the rest of Hell (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.540–543; 638 ff.; Nisbet-Hubbard 215–216 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 2.13.23, *sedes* . . . *discriptas piorum*; possibly Tib. 1.3.57–66 [with Smith 253]); others even situate Elysium in the heavens (cf. Serv. *Aen.* 5.735; Luc. *Civ.* 9.1 ff. and Schol. Luc.). On the identification of Elysium with the Isles of the Blest and the land of the Phaeacians (Σχερία), see E. Cook, "Ferrymen of Elysium and the Homeric Phaeacians", *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 20 (1992) 239–267. For the Virgilian Elysium, see A. Novara, "Les *imagines* de l'Élysée virgilien", in Hinard, pp. 321–349 (esp. pp. 330 ff.). Another frequent term for Elysium is the 'Ovidian' *Elysias* . . . *domos* in Ov. *Met.* 14.111 (with Bömer 49); later in Sen. *Her. O.* 1917; Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.23; Mart. 1.93.2.

24 Lethaeam . . . ratem: cf. Lygd. 3.10, *Lethaea* . . . *rate* (comm.).

Cimmerios . . . lacus: ie *infernos lacus*. The Cimmerians were a semi-fabulous people that lived in a cold, inhospitable country where

the sun never shone; Ulysses came to this land to call up the dead and question the seer Tiresias; cf. Hom. *Od.* 11.14–19, ἔνθα δὲ Κιμμερίων ἀνδρῶν δῆμός τε πόλις τε, / ἠέρι καὶ νεφέλῃ κεκαλυμμένοι· οὐδε ποτ' αὐτοὺς / Ἠέλιος φαέθων καταδέρκεται ἀκτίνεσσιν, / οὔθ' ὁπότ' ἂν στείχῃσι πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα, / οὔθ' ὅτ' ἂν ἂψ ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἀπ' οὐρανόθεν προτράπηται, / ἀλλ' ἐπὶ νὺξ ὀλοὴ τέταται δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσι; Cic. *Ac.* 2.61, (*Cimmerii*), *quibus aspectum solis sive deus aliquis sive natura ademerat sive eius loci, quem incolebant, situs*; [Tib.] 3.7.64–66, *Cimmerion etiam obscuras* [scil. *Ulixes*] *accessit ad arces, / quis numquam candente dies apparuit ortu, / seu supra terras Phoebus seu curreret infra*; as a symbol of "inhospitable land" in Ov. *Ponto* 4.10.1–2, *haec mihi Cimmerio bis tertia ducitur aetas litore*; Lehmann-Haupt, *RE* 11.397 ff. Geographically, this people is sometimes situated in the far west, at other times to the north or north-west of the Black Sea, and sometimes even around Cumae, in Italy (cf. Paul. Fest. p. 43 M), no doubt because there was a gate to the Underworld there and the Cimmerians were thought to live near the land of the dead (cf. Grimal, *Mitología*, p. 104; *OCD* 240). This ancient conception of the geographical proximity between the land of the Cimmerians and the Underworld no doubt arose from the comparable gloom and darkness of both regions. It is not by chance that Ovid also situates near the land of the Cimmerians the *domus Somni* or δῆμος ὀνείρων (cf. *Met.* 11.592–593 [with Bömer 397]), since Sleep, according to Hesiod (*Th.* 211), is a brother of Death, and like the latter a child of Night. On the territory of the Cimmerians as a dark and gloomy zone, cf. [Tib.] 3.7.64, *Cimmerion* . . . *obscuras* . . . *arces* (with Tränkel 203); Cic. *Luc.* 61, *Cimmeriis* . . . *quibus aspectum solis* . . . *deus* . . . *ademerat.* In this way *Cimmerius*—like other conventional epithets of Hell, namely *Lethaeus*, *Elysius*, *Tartareus*—is eventually used as a poetic equivalent of *infernus*, and by reference to the gloom of the kingdom of Hades, allusion is made to Hades himself ("gloomy" > "infernal"); cf. [Verg.] *Cul.* 232, *feror avia carpens avia Cimmerios inter distantia lucos*; Stat. *Silv.* 3.2.92, *Cimmeriumque chaos* ("gloomy Hades"); Sil. 12.132, *Cimmerias* . . . *domos.* The "Cimmerian darkness" (*Cimmeriae tenebrae*) became proverbial (cf. Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 83 s.v. *Cimmerii*; Bömer 397 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 11.592). For further references to the Cimmerians in Latin literature, cf. *ThLL Onom.* II C 443.54 ff.

For the phrase, cf. Capel. 6.662, *lacus Cimmerius* (= *Pontus Euxinus*); *CIL.* 5.5737.7 (in agro Mediolanensis, a. 523), *non Tartara sentit Cymeriosque lacus.* For the poetic use of the term *lacus* to refer to the

waters or rivers of the underworld, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.134, *Stygios . . . lacus*; 392–393, *nec vero Alciden me sum laetus euntem / accepisse lacu*; [Verg.] *Cul.* 372–373, *Ditis opacos / cogor adire lacus*; Tib. 1.10.38, *ad obscuros . . . lacus*; 2.6.40, *ad infernos . . . lacus*; Prop. 2.28B.40, *ad infernos . . . lacus*; Ov. *Ars* 3.322, *Tartareos . . . lacus*; Luc. *Civ.* 6.662, *Stygiosque lacus*; Sen. *Ag.* 750, *Stygios lacus*; Mart. 1.78.4, *Stygios . . . adire lacus/*; 5.25.6, *quis non volt totus adire lacus?*; *OLD lacus* 1c; for the rivers of the underworld described as "lakes", cf. also Ar. *Ra.* 137–138, εὐθὺς γὰρ ἐπὶ λίμνην μεγάλην ἥξεις πάνυ / ἄβυσσον; Verg. *Aen.* 6.323, *Stygiam . . . paludem*; Ov. *Met.* 1.737, *Stygias . . . paludes.*

25–26: the warm and positive image of old age in this distich—which is unmistakably Tibullan in tone (cf. Tib. 1.7.55–56; 10.44; 2.5.93–94)—puts a ring-composition ending to the passage devoted to *mors inmatura/mors matura* which began with the opposing negative image of destructive old age in ll. 15–16 (*damnosa senectus*). On old age in Tibullus, cf. É. Évrard, "Vieux et ancien chez Tibulle", *Latomus* 37 (1978) 121–147; A. García Leal, "Juventud y vejez en Tibulo", *Simposio Tibuliano*, Univ. de Murcia 1985, pp. 255–262.

25: for the wrinkles of old age (*ruga senilis*), cf. Verg. *Aen.* 7.416–417, (*Allecto*) *in vultus sese transformat anilis / et frontem obscenam rugis arat*; Tib. 2.2.19–20, *dum tarda senectus inducat rugas inficiatque comas*; Prop. 3.25.14, *speculo rugas increpitante tibi*; Ov. *Ars* 2.118, *iam venient rugae quae tibi corpus arent*; *Medic.* 46, *rugis vultus aratus erit*; *Met.* 3.276, *sulcavit . . . cutem rugis*; 7.291; 14.96, *rugis peraravit anilibus ora*; 15.234, *rugas . . . aniles*; *Fasti* 5.58, *ruga senilis*; *Tr.* 3.7.34, ***ruga*** *. . . in antiqua fronte* ***senilis*** *erit*; *Ponto* 1.4.2, *iamque meos vultus* ***ruga senilis*** *arat*; for the pale complexion of the elderly, cf. Sen. *Ben.* 7.27.3, *senes pallidos.*

rugosa: the adjective first appears in Lucil. 430 and 557 (= 438 and 560 Krenkel); Valg. Ruf. *Frg.* 1 Büchner; it is hardly used by the Augustan poets: Hor. 2 (*Epod.* 9.14; *Ep.* 1.18.105); Verg. 0; Tib. 0; Prop. 1 (4.5.67, *rugoso . . . collo*); Ov. 5 (*Am.* 1.8.112, *rugosas . . . genas* [with McKeown 255]; *Her.* 5.28; *Met.* 7.626 [with Bömer 358]; 8.674; *Fasti* 1.185). For the lines on the face of the elderly, cf. Ov. *Met.* 3.276, *sulcavitque cutem rugis* (with Bömer 522); 7.291.

ora: poetic plural; see Lygd. 4.87 *terga* (comm.).

senecta: see Lygd. 3.8 (comm.).

26: formulation on the model of Tib. 1.10.44, (*liceat*) *temporis et prisci facta referre senem.* Lygdamus' reworking of the line seeks to reintroduce, by means of *pueris*, the same family atmosphere of the Tibullan model (cf. *prole*, l. 39; *filius*, l. 41; *nato*, l. 50; *progeniem*, l. 52). Note the

brachylogy forced by this remodelling in *referam . . . tempora prisca* (= *referam temporis prisci facta*, cf. Tib. 1.10.44). For this realistic detail of the old man telling stories of the past, a commonplace not only in poetry but also in rhetorico-philosophical diatribe, Smith 384 and Murgatroyd 290 *ad* Tib. 1.10.44 refer to Homer's aged Nestor; Arist. *Rhet.* 2.13.12; Cato (*passim*) in Cic. *Sen.*; Hor. *Poet.* 173–174. For the Tibullan image of old age surrounded by the warmth and affection of children, cf. also Tib. 1.7.55–56, *at tibi* (scil. *Messallae*) *succrescat proles, quae facta parentis / augeat et circa stet veneranda senem*; 2.5.93–94, *nec taedebit avum parvo advigilare nepoti / balbaque cum puero dicere verba senem.*

pueris . . . prisca senex: note, on the one hand, the antithesis *pueris/senex*, with each term placed at the end of its hemistich (cf. Tib. 2.5.94); and, on the other, the juxtaposition *prisca senex*, reinforced by the proximity of *senecta* in the previous hexameter, also at the end of the line.

prisca: the adjective *priscus* can point to a more or less distant past, but always a past which is "outdated", "no longer relevant"; cf. É. Évrard, "Vieux et ancien chez Tibulle", *Latomus* 37 (1978) 144–145; "*priscus* désigne une réalité qui, encore existante ou déjà disparue, est le témoin d'une époque révolue dont elle porte la marque" (*idem*, p. 146); Fordyce (298 *ad* Catul. 64.159) also stresses the connotations of severity which this adjective often has (cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.21.11, *prisci Catonis*).

senex: as is always the case in Tibullus, *senex* occupies the emphatic end-of-pentameter position in Lygdamus also; cf. Évrard, *art. cit.*, pp. 124–125.

27–28: a wish that the fevers might not prove serious, but in fact two weeks have already passed and they show no sign of subsiding. The hexameter presents some problems regarding text and interpretation. The traditional reading *terrear* is in itself possible and as such has been accepted by virtually all editors at all periods. Another tempting possibility, however, is the reading *torrear*, which Luck introduces into his text from certain mss. and which was already present in the *editio princeps minor* of 1472; if this reading is accepted, it suggests the motif of the fire of love—for which, cf. Groeneboom *ad* A. *Pr.* 590, 649–650; Gow 146 *ad* Theocr. 7.55; Pease 86–87 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 4.2; Kost 162 *ad* Musae. 19; Nisbet-Hubbard 372 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 1.33.6; Tarrant 200 *ad* Sen. *Ag.* 132; Pichon, pp. 166 *ignis*, 281 *torreri*, 301 *urere*; the *locus classicus* is E. *Hipp.* 530–533—or even love

as an illness and fever (νόσος, *morborum causa*; cf. E. *Hipp.* 766; Pl. *Cist.* 71; *Mil.* 1272; Caecil. *Com.* 262; Catul. 76.25 [cf. 20]; Tib. 2.5.109–110 [with Murgatroyd 230–231]; Prop. 2.1.58; Ov. *Rem.* 81; 115). The *locus classicus* where the symptoms of love are described with «medizinische Genauigkeit» (Buchholz, *Zur Darstellung des Pathos der Liebe in der Hellenistischen Dichtung*, p. 26) is Theocr. 2.85–90 (τις καπυρὰ νόσος, l. 85); cf. also Ov. *Ars* 1.729–738; A. La Penna, "Note sul linguaggio erotico dell'elegia latina", *Maia* 4 (1951) 206–207; G. Giangrande, "Symptoms of Love in Theocritus and Ovid", *Analecta Malacitana* 13.1 (1990) 121–123. In addition, commentators disagree on the meaning of the term *aestu* here. Some hold that the obvious meaning of "feverish heat" cannot be defended here because of the adjective *vano*, and propose instead the sense of "anguish", pointing to Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.109–110, *hiscine versiculis speras tibi posse dolores / atque aestus curasque gravis e pectore pelli?* However, *vano* is simply a pleonastic reinforcement of *nequiquam* (cf. Catul. 64.111, [scil. *Minotaurum*] *nequiquam vanis iactantem cornua ventis*), as in comparable phrases in the works of the major elegists (eg Tib. 1.8.60, *et* ***strepitu nullo clam*** *reserare fores*; 10.34, *imminet, et* ***tacito clam*** *venit illa pede*; Ov. *Ars* 3.712, *ipsa nemus* ***tacito clam pede*** *fortis init*; Vahlen, *Opuscula* I, p. 363). For the erotic connotations of *aestus* ("flame"), cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.2.39; for *aestuare*, cf. eg Ov. *Met.* 9.465; 10.359–360, (*Myrrha*) *patriis . . . in vultibus haerens /* ***aestuat.***

27 atque utinam: when it begins a wish-clause with *utinam*, the copulative-emphatic particle *atque* reinforces the *utinam*; cf. Cic. *Or.* 22; Verg. *Ecl.* 10.35, *atque utinam ex vobis unus vestrique fuissem!*; *Aen.* 1.575; [Verg.] *Cir.* 297 (with Lyne 227); *Lydia* 56; frequent in Propertius (cf. 1.9.8; 11.9; 2.9.47; 13.43; 14.15; 15.25; 16.19; 33A.3) and Ovid (*Am.* 2.17.5; *Her.* 20.178; 21.77; *Rem.* 339; 466; *Met.* 6.540; 10.202; 13.43; 14.669; *Fasti* 6.371; *Tr.* 1.9.3; 2.557; 3.3.59; 4.3.39; 5.1.19; 5.7.23; *Ponto* 1.5.28; 4.7.13; 4.9.51; 4.11.5; 21; 4.15.21; *Ib.* 445; *Nux* 163; cf. E. Hübner, "Das *Epicedion Drusi*", *Hermes* 13 [1878] 182); in the *Corp. Tib.*, apart from the present passage of Lygdamus, only in [Tib.] 3.19.5, *atque utinam posses uni mihi bella videri!* This particle *atque*, more frequent in the literary than in the popular language, where it ceased to be used at the start of the imperial period, is a great favourite of the archaizing authors. Cf. Kühner-Stegmann 2.2.15; Hofmann-Szantyr 475 (§ 254 *Zus.* c δ); Ernout-Thomas 239–241 (§ 258); Bassols II.89–91 (§ 90); *ThLL* 5.2.906.30.

nequiquam: a more high-flown term than *frustra* (see Lygd. 4.14

[comm.]). However, the fact is that, in poetry, *nequiquam* seems to be the preserve of epic, not elegy: in Ovid, of 18 appearances, 16 are in the *Metamorphoses*, 1 in the *Fasti* (6.108), and 1 in the *Amores* (1.6.27); of 41 appearances in Virgil, 26 are in the *Aeneid*; of 5 in Horace, 3 are in the *Odes*; in elegy, apart from the present case and the example from Ovid cited, there are only two occurrences in Propertius (2.4.5; 3.17.23), and none in Tibullus. Nevertheless, *frustra* is not thereby excluded from epic: in Ov., 79 appearances, 43 in *Met.*, 7 in *Fasti*, the rest in *Am.*; in Verg., 29, of which 19 are in *Aen.*; in Hor., 14 cases, 5 in *Od.*; 5 times in Tibullus, 7 in Propertius; cf. McKeown 139 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.6.27 (*nequiquam*); Ed. Wölfflin, "Frustra, nequiquam und Synonima", *ALL* 2 (1885) 1–24; Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, p. 128 n. 22; Hofmann-Szantyr 447 (§ 241b); *ThLL* 6.1429.57 ff.

torrear aestu: for the expression *torrear aestu*, cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.2.39–40, *an magis hic meus est animi, non aeris,* ***aestus,*** */ captaque femineus pectora* ***torret*** *amor*; Sen. *Phaed.* 362, (*Phaedra*) *torretur aestu tacito* (of the fire of amorous passion); Col. *Rust.* 4.19.3, *terra . . . acclivis torrensque aestu*; cf. Ov. *Ponto* 1.10.5, *nec febribus uror anhelis*; cf. also Hor. *Od.* 3.19.28, *me lentus Glycerae torret amor meae.* For *torreri* 'sensu erotico', cf. also Catul. 100.7, *cum vesana meas torreret flamma medullas*; Prop. 3.24.13, *correptus saevo Veneris torrebar aeno*; Ov. *Rem.* 491, *quamvis infelix media torreberis Aetna*; Pichon, p. 281 s.v.

28 languent . . . mea membra: Lygdamus' use of *languere* is midway between the rare, late sense of "to be convalescent", always with a personal subject (cf. [Tib.] 3.10.13, *langueat illa*; Ov. *Am.* 2.2.21–22, *ibit ad affectam, quae non languebit, amicam: / visat et indiciis aegra sit illa tuis*; Petr. *Satyr.* 101.10, *visere languentem*; *ThLL* 7.2.921.73 ff.) and an old use of this verb in connection with illness ("to be weak", "to lose strength"), with an explicit ablative of cause *morbo* (or sim.) and impersonal subject (*corpora* or sim.); cf. Lucr. 6.1221, *languebant pleraque morbo*; Verg. *Ge.* 4.252, *tristi languebunt corpora morbo*; Ov. *Am.* 3.7.25, *num mea Thessalico languent devota veneno / corpora?*; *ThLL* 7.2.921.30 ff. For the phrase *languere membra*, cf. Lucr. 5.1008; 6.797; Sil. 1.503; 10.274; 11.418; Stat. *Theb.* 6.589; *ThLL* 7.2.921.34–36.

ter quinos: ie *quindecim* (a simple cardinal with no distributive force). The use of multiplicative periphrases to express numbers belongs both to the solemn and magical ambit of sacred language (hence their sporadic appearance in high-flown passages in prose; eg Cic. *Rep.* 6.12, *septenos octiens solis anfractus*; Liv. 27.37.7, *virgines ter novenae*; Plin. *Nat. passim*), and to poetic language, where the breaking-down

of the prosaic cardinal number is due to metrical convenience. However, of the two possible types of multiplicative periphrases, both prose—in all periods—and post-classical (post-Ovidian) poetry prefer the combination of a numeral adverb with a distributive (*ter quinos*), while Augustan poets like Virgil and Ovid tend to use the type formed by a numeral adverb followed by a cardinal number (*ter septem, bis sex, ter deni*); cf. eg Enn. *Ann.* 323 V[2]; Verg. *Ecl.* 1.43; *Aen.* 1.393; Prop. 2.20.7; Ov. *Met.* 3.351, *ter ad quinos unum Cephisius annum*; 8.243; *Fasti* 1.28; *Tr.* 1.1.117, *ter quinque volumina* (with Luck 24); 2.94, *decem deciens . . . viris* (= *centumviris*); 4.10.10, *tribus . . . quater mensibus*); Sen. *Tro.* 386; *Oed.* 251; Mart. 9.93.7, *bis quina mihi da basia*; Bömer 362 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.497 (with *loci Ovidiani*) and *ad* Ov. *Fasti* vol. I, p. 20–21; Courtney 204 *ad* Juv. 4.16–17; Tarrant 325 *ad* Sen. *Ag.* 812; Laguna 134 *ad* Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.18, *bis seno limite menses*; Coleman 65 *ad* Stat. *Silv.* 4.1.1, *bis octonis . . . fastis*; Fr. Seibel, *Quibus artificiis poetae Latini numerorum vocabula difficilia evitaverint*, Diss. München 1909; B. Löfstedt, *Eranos* 56 (1958) 92; Hofmann-Szantyr § 113 a) *Zusatz*, p. 212; Krummrey, *Klio* 48 (1967) 111–112; *ThLL* 7.2.556.59 ff.; for the general tendency of poetic language to avoid numerals, see Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, pp. 96–97.

sed: the placing of this conjunction in the fourth position in the clause is extremely daring, and the only case in Latin poetry. This particle normally occupies initial position in the clause, although it is not infrequent for it to be postponed in poetry (see the commentary on Lygd. 1.19 *sed*).

membra: ie *corpus* (cf. Enn. *Ann.* 139; Lucr. 3.117; Verg. *Aen.* 1.691; 9.337; Hor. *Sat.* 1.9.24; Ov. *Met.* 10.237; Luc. *Civ.* 9.1043; *i.a.*).

29–34: Lygdamus again addresses his friends.

29–30: closely linked to the preceding distich, this is a ring-composition return, in chiastic form (*vos . . . at mihi/mea membra . . . at vobis*), to the opening motif, the contrasting situation of the poet and his friends.

29: traditionally, *celebrare* has been interpreted fere i. q. *frequentare* (a standard sense in Ovid; cf. Bömer 78 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 1.172), which prompted more than one early editor to emend the awkward *numina* (Heinsius conjectured *flumina*; Broukhusius, *gramina*). However, as is rightly observed by Tränkle 149–150, the combination *numina celebrare* leaves no doubt that *celebrare* here has the sense of "to venerate"; cf. Ov. *Fasti* 4.865, *numina . . . Veneris celebrate, puellae*; Sil. 8.183, *aeternum . . . Italis numen celebrabere in oris*; for *celebrare* in the sense of "to worship a

god", cf. Verg. *Aen.* 8.74–76 (Aeneas is addressing the god Tiber), *quo te cumque lacus miserantem incommoda nostra / fonte tenet, quocumque solo pulcherrimus exis, / semper honore meo, semper celebrabere donis*; Tib. 1.3.33, *at mihi contingat patrios celebrare Penates*; 7.63, *Natalis multos celebrande per annos*; Ov. *Fasti* 6.775; for the infrequent use of the compound *concelebrare*, cf. Murgatroyd 228 *ad* Tib. 1.7.59–60, *Genium . . . / concelebra.*

vobis: dative of agent. Its use extends to the passive personal forms of the present stem in the imperial period, both in poetry and among prose-writers; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.440, *neque cernitur ulli*; Kühner-Stegmann 1.324; Hofmann-Szantyr 96–98 (§ 67 d); Ernout-Thomas 74–75 (§ 94 c); Bassols I.109–110 (§ 100).

numina: for the term see Lygd. 4.53 (comm.).

30: poetic periphrasis to refer to the action of swimming. Roman thermal spas were equipped with swimming-pools. We know of those at Baiae from various literary sources; cf. Prop. 1.11.11–12, *aut teneat clausam* (scil. *Cynthiam*) *tenui Teuthrantis in unda / alternae facilis cedere lympha manu*, a passage which undoubtedly has an influence on the formulation of the present line of Lygdamus; Mart. 6.43.1–2, *dum tibi felices indulgent, Castrice, Baiae / canaque sulphureis nympha natatur aquis*; Rut. Nam. 1.247–248, *qualis in Euboicis* (scil. *Cumanis*) *captiva natantibus unda sustinet alterno bracchia* ***lenta*** *sono.* For the formulation, cf. also Tib. 1.4.12, *hic placidam niveo pectore* ***pellit*** *aquam*; Ov. *Her.* 19.48, ***lenta****que dimotis* ***bracchia*** *iactat aquis*; *Ib.* 587, *si qua per alternos pulsabitur unda lacertos.* For the description of the action of swimming, cf. also Ov. *Met.* 4.353–354, *desilit in latices alternaque bracchia ducens / in liquidis translucet aquis* (with Bömer 122); 5.595–596, *nudaque mergor aquis; quas dum ferioque trahoque / mille modis labens excussaque bracchia iacto . . .*; *Ibis* 589, *si qua per alternos pulsabitur unda lacertos*; Manil. 5.423, *alterna feriens in lentos bracchia tractus.*

facilis . . . unda: ie 'facilis cedere natanti unda vel cedens natanti unda' ("offering no resistance to the swimmer"); cf. Prop. 1.11.12, *alternae facilis cedere lympha manu* (with Fedeli 275). For the expression, apart from the passage of Propertius cited, cf. Prop. 1.20.47, *facili . . . liquore*; Luc. *Civ.* 1.222, *faciles . . . undas*; *OLD facilis* 5b; *ThLL* 6.57.65–67.

lenta . . . manu: ie *flexibilis*, *mobilis* (cf. Ov. *Met.* 2.419–420, *lentos . . . arcus* = Ov. *Am.* 3.3.29, *flexibiles . . . arcus*); cf. Jackson Knight, *Acta Classica* 1 (1958) 39: "the adjective *lentus* is almost a poem in itself". In practice, the adjective *lentus* ("yielding to pressure") behaves in an ambivalent manner, depending on whether the emphasis falls on one or the other half of its basic definition: a) *flexibilis*, *ductilis*, *mobilis*;

cf. *OLD lentus* 1a; *ThLL* 7.2.1163.9 ff.; b) *tardus, piger, segnis*; cf. Lygd. 6.57, *cessas, o lente minister?*; *OLD lentus* 4a; *ThLL* 7.2.1162.15 ff.; on the polysemy of this adjective, cf. Non. p. 337–33, *lentum significat tardum . . . securum, otiosum . . . flexuosum . . . patiens, placidum . . . facile . . . tenax . . . frigidum*; Fordyce 300–301 *ad* Catul. 64.183; Lyne 307 *ad* [Verg.] *Cir.* 504.

For the combination *lenta manus*, cf. Sen. *Contr.* 3 praef. 10, *lentiores manus*; [Sen.] *Oct.* 820, *o lenta nimium militis nostri manus*; cf. also the parallel expression *lentis Bracchia* in Hor. *Epod.* 15.6, *lentis adherens bracchiis*; *Sat.* 1.9.64, *et prensare manu lentissima bracchia*; [Verg.] *Cir.* 504, *lenta . . . perpetuas fuderunt bracchia pennas*; Ov. *Her.* 18.58, *iactabam liquido bracchia lenta mari*; Ov. *Her.* 19.48 (*sup. cit.*); [Sen.] *Oct.* 354, *bracchia quamvis lenta trahentem*; Rut. Nam. 1.248 (*sup. cit.*); *ThLL* 7.2.1163.69–72.

31–32: Feeling close to death, Lygdamus wishes his friends a happy life and begs them not to forget him, whether he finally dies or lives. The motif is characteristic of farewells before a journey (προπεμπτικά) and tombstone inscriptions (eg *CLE* 859, *vivite felices nostrisque profundite Manis / et memores ut sitis nobiscum vos esse futuros*).

31 vivite felices: for *vivite felices* as a moving farewell formula, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.493–494 (Aeneas to Helen and Andromache), *vivite felices, quibus est fortuna peracta / iam sua: nos alia ex aliis in fata vocamur*; it is particularly common in funerary inscriptions as a warning from the dead man to the living, exhorting them to enjoy a happy life, before *mors inimica et properata* frustrates any further attempt to do so; cf. *CLE* 373.1, *vivite felices quibus est data vita fruend[a]*; 447.6; 802.2; 803.2; 804.1; 805.1; 859.1 *sup. cit.*; 1004.3; 1081.1; 1082.1; 1091.3; 1095.9; 1117.5; 2023.1; likewise the parallel formula *laetus vive* (cf. *CLE* 245.1–2, *vive laetus quique vivis, vita parvo[m] munus est, / mox exorta est, sensim vigescit, deinde sensim deficit*) or the *vive vale* with which many epitaphs close (cf. *CLE* 1299.1; 1431.13; 1533.11; *vive, viator* in *CLE* 1523.11). Cf. A. González Ovies, "El «más acá» en los epitafios latinos", *Actas del VIII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*, Madrid 1994, vol. II, p. 669.

The predicative *felices* reinforces the emphatic, hedonistic sense that *vivere* itself often has ("to enjoy life to the full"), especially in exhortations of the *carpe diem* type (cf. Fordyce 106 *ad* Catul. 5.1 *vivamus, mea Lesbia, atque amemus*; Hor. *Od.* 3.29.43; Verg. *Ecl.* 8.58, *vivite silvae*). The clear contrast between this line and the following (life/death) suggests that *vivite* should be taken as having a strongly hedonistic

tone, rather than viewed as a simple emphatic substitute for *este* (or *estote*), a very frequent usage in the 'sermo cotidianus' (cf. Pl. *Trin.* 390, *lepidus vivis*; *Men.* 908, *ne ego homo vivo miser*; *Bacch.* 614; Cic. *Att.* 3.5; Catul. 10.33 [with Fordyce 124]). The strong hedonistic tone of *vivere* becomes particularly dramatic in the brief words with which Damon says farewell to his bucolic world shortly before committing suicide: *vivite, silvae* (Verg. *Ecl.* 8.58); cf. Ch. Fantazzi, "Virgilian Pastoral and Roman Love Poetry", *AJPh* 87 (1966) 182.

memores . . . vivite nostri: for the formulation, in addition to Tib. 1.3.2, *o utinam memores . . . mei*, cited in the commentary on l. 1, cf. Prop. 1.11.5, *nostri . . . memores*; Ov. *Am.* 2.11.37, *vade memor nostri, vento reditura secundo*; *Her.* 11.127 (Canace to Macareus before she commits suicide), *vive memor nostri*; *Met.* 14.730 (Iphis before hanging himself), *este mei memores* (= *Met.* 13.380). Observe the striking similarity of the line as a whole with Hor. *Od.* 3.27.13–14, *sis licet felix . . . et memor nostri, Galataea, vivas.*

nostri: genitive characteristic of adjectives and verbs of remembering or forgetting in all periods of Latin; cf. Kühner-Stegmann 2.1.437; Hofmann-Szantyr 78 (§ 59 a) and 80 (§ 60 a); Ernout-Thomas 52 (§ 65 c); Bassols I.77–78 (§ 62).

32: against the traditional reading *velint*, Broukhusius adopted the attractive variant *volent* (H, 'unus Statii'), thus getting round the problem of the change of mood (*erimus . . . velint*), and was followed by Vulpius, Heyne-Wunderlich, De Golbéry and Luck (cf. Prop. 1.14.14, *fata perire volent*). However, there do not seem to be weighty enough reasons to justify the change.

seu nos fata fuisse velint: the construction *fata volent* + accusative + infinitive is frequently found in poetry from Prop. 1.6.30, *hanc me militiam fata subire volunt.* It is the poetic variant of the formula *fatum est*, "it is predestined that" (cf. Cic. *Fat.* 28, *si fatum tibi est ex hoc morbo convalescere*). Propertian, too, is the recourse to this formula to allude 'per euphemismum' to death; cf. Prop. 1.14.14, *dum me fata perire volent!*); for the expression *fata volunt*, cf. also Sen. *Her. O.* 1180; [Sen.] *Oct.* 552; Luc. *Civ.* 2.544; Aus. 10.12 Peiper; Claud. Don. *Aen.* 7.314; *CLE* 186.4; 1150.3 (= *ILS* 7589); *ThLL* 6.1.363.15–17. For the parallel expressions *fata negant, fata sinunt, fata urgent, fata vocant* and sim., cf. Lygd. 3.35 (comm.) and 3.37 *me vocet* (comm.).

fuisse: the pregnant sense of *fuisse* with the meaning "to be dead (< to have ceased to exist)" is attested as early as Plautus; cf. *Capt.* 516, *nunc illud est quom me fuisse quam esse . . . mavelim*; cf. also [Verg.]

Maec. 158, *cum dicar subita voce fuisse tibi*; Verg. *Aen.* 2.325–326, *fuimus Troes, fuit Ilium et ingens / gloria Teucrorum*; Sil. 6.476, *fuit ille*; *CIL* 10.4993.

33–34: Lygdamus closes the elegy by asking his friends to pray to *Dis* for his good health. The appeal to this god in illness is unusual, since in such cases, as the inscriptions show, it was normal to appeal to Aesculapius, or to Aesculapius and Hygieia (*Salus*), or to *Valetudo*, and in imperial times to Isis. Sacrifices to the gods of the underworld consisted of black victims and libations of milk and wine. The most enlightening literary passage in this respect is Ov. *Met.* 7.244–250:

> *Sacra facit* (scil. *Medea*) *cultrosque in guttura velleris atri*
> *conicit et patulas perfundit sanguine fossas.*
> *Tum super invergens liquidi carchesia vini*
> *alteraque invergens tepidi carchesia lactis*
> *verba simul fudit terrenaque numina lenit*
> *umbrarumque rogat rapta cum coniuge* (= *Perseph.*) *regem* (= *Ditem*),
> *ne properent artus anima fraudare senili* (scil. *Aesonis*).

Cf. also Sen. *Oed.* 556 ff.:

> *sanguinem libat focis,*
> *solidasque pecudes urit, et multo specum*
> *saturat cruore. Libat et niveum insuper*
> *lactis liquorem; fundit et Bacchum manu*
> *laeva.*

Descriptions of sacrificial rituals in honour of the *dei inferi*, or the powers of darkness in general, can ultimately be traced back to Hom. *Od.* 11.23–50.

33 interea: ie *interim*, "in the meantime", that is, as long as the final outcome of the illness is uncertain. On this adverb, see O. W. Reinmuth, "Vergil's Use of *Interea*. A Study of the Treatment of Contemporaneous Events in Roman Epic", *AJPh* 54 (1933) 323–339.

nigras pecudes: ie 'hostias nigri velleris'. As a general rule, the propitiatory victims sacrificed to the *dei superi* had to be white (technical term *alba hostia*; *nivea*, *candens* or *candida* in poetry and poetic prose); cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.8.6–7, *voveram . . . album / Libero caprum*; *Saec.* 49; Verg. *Ge.* 2.146, *albi . . . greges*; *Aen.* 4.61; 5.236–237 (*candentem . . . taurum*); 8.82–85 (*candida . . . cum fetu concolor albo/ . . . sus*); Ov. *Am.* 3.13.13; *Fasti* 1.720; *Ponto* 4.4.31, *boves niveos*; Sen. *Ag.* 364 (with Tarrant 242); *Med.* 61; Juv. 12.3, *niveam . . . agnam*; Amm. 22.12; Claud. 28.506; Arn. 2.68; Krause, "Hostia", *RE Suppl.* V (1931) 244–245; on the other hand, victims sacrificed to the *dei inferi* had to be black (tech-

nical term *atra hostia*; *nigra* in poetry and poetic prose); cf. Lucr. 3.52–53; Verg. *Ge.* 4.546, *nigram mactabis ovem*; *Aen.* 5.97; 736; 6.153, *duc nigras pecudes*; 249, *atri velleri agnam*; Tib. 1.2.64, *concidit ad magicos hostia pulla deos* (with Smith 224; Murgatroyd 89); Ov. *Met.* 7.244, *sacra facit cultrosque in guttura velleris atri* (with Bömer 266); Sil. 13.404–406, *'mactare repostis / mos umbris', inquit, 'consueta piacula nigras / sub lucem pecudes'*; Plin. *Nat.* 10.156; Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* 4.9.2; Arn. 7.19, *quae in coloribus ratio est, ut merito his albas, illis atras conveniat nigerrimasque mactari?*; Krause, "Hostia", *RE Suppl.* 5 (1931) 245–246; with regard to the principle of similarity, reflecting the idea that the *dei inferi* were black, cf. Serv. *Ge.* 2.380, *victimae numinibus aut per similitudinem aut per contrarietatem immolantur: per similitudinem, ut nigrum pecus Plutoni.* Thus, animals of a reddish colour were sacrificed to the divinities of fire. Similarly, male animals were sacrificed to gods, and female animals to goddesses (cf. Val.-Max. 2.4.5, *caesis . . . atris bubus, Diti maribus, feminis Proserpinae*; Arn. 7.19).

Although the generic term *pecudes* may be considered to cover domestic animals of all kinds, we know that it was applied especially to sheep (cf. Suet. *Frg.* 176 [p. 286Re], *pecudes oves tantum accipimus, pecora autem mixtura omnium animalium est*). For the phrase *nigras pecudes*, cf. Lucr. 3.52; Verg. *Aen.* 6.153, *duc nigras pecudes;* cf. also *Aen.* 3.120, [*mactavit*] *nigram Hiemi pecudem, Zephyris felicibus albam*; 5.736; Sil. 13.405–406; *ThLL* 10.1.957.71–73.

promittite: scil. 'pro salute mea (i.e. Lygdami)'. The use of the verb *promittere* in the sense of *vovere* is attested from an early date (cf. *CIL* 1.2231, *votum quod promeisit . . . pro filio*; Cic. *Verr.* 5.184; Flor. *Epit.* 1.11.4; Suet. *Cal.* 27.2, *votum exegit ab eo, qui pro salute sua gladiatoriam operam promiserat*), though rarely found in poetry. However, see Juv. 13.232, *pecudem spondere sacello / balantem, et Laribus cristam promittere galli / non audent.*

Diti: on this name for the gods of the underworld, see the commentary on Lygd. 1.28.

34: for libations of wine and milk to the *dei inferi*, apart from Ov. *Met.* 7.246–247 and Sen. *Oed.* 558–559 (cited above), cf. Verg. *Aen.* 5.77–78, *hic duo rite mero libans carchesia Baccho / fundit humi, duo lacte novo, duo sanguine sacro.* Traditionally, *mixta* has been interpreted in its primary sense of "mixed with"; however, as the passages of Ovid and Seneca show, the libations were separate ones of milk and wine, not milk and wine mixed together. According to Tränkle 151, *mixta* here is to be taken in the sense of "together with".

nivei lactis: for the phrase, cf. Lygd. 2.20 *niveo lacte* (comm.).

mixta mero: the prosaic expression *miscere cum* is rare in poetry (though it appears as early as Pl. *Trin.* 122; cf. Ov. *Her.* 10.38; *Met.* 4.307; 309; 728; 5.454; 12.54, *mixta cum veris*; 256; *Ponto* 1.9.20, *cum . . . meis lacrimis miscuit . . . suas*), as is the simple ablative (though this structure is found in Pl. *Aul.* 279, *malum maerore mixtum*; cf. Lucr. 2.223; 6.159; Verg. *Aen.* 12.838; Ov. *Fasti* 1.128; 4.625; 6.566; *Met.* 4.504; Val.-Max. 1.6.5). The norm in poetry, however, and also in post-classical prose, is the structure with the dative (from Enn. *Var.* 46, *frigori miscet calorem umori aritudinem*; cf. Lucr. 3.234; Verg. *Aen.* 8.432; Ov. *Fasti* 4.371; *Met.* 1.51 [with Bömer 33]; 82; 2.634; 850; 3.529; 4.140–141, *fletumque cruori / miscuit*; 652; 8.674; Luc. *Civ.* 5.2, *miscens adversa secundis* [with Barratt 2]; Kühner-Stegmann I.317.6a); in prose from early imperial times (cf. Liv. 24.31.3, *miscendi eos agmini suo*; Frontin. *Strat.* 2.7.13, *miscuit vera falsis*); predominantly poetic is the structure *miscere in* (cf. Lucr. 1.569; 815; 3.276–277; 4.310; Verg. *Aen.* 5.469–470; Ov. *Met.* 3.423, *in niveo mixtum candore ruborem*; *ThLL* 7.1.775.50; 8.1091.30). Cf. Ch. E. Bennet, "The Ablative of Association", *TAPhA* 36 (1905) 72–73; E. B. Lease, "Notes on Latin Syntax", *AJPh* 30 (1909) 300–301; Hofmann-Szantyr 115 (§ 76a).

The Lygdamean use of *mixtus* expresses simple coordination (= *et* or *-que*), not "mixed with", as is sometimes the case with *cum*, for instance, *Romulus cum Remo* (cf. Ov. *Met.* 14.504). This attenuated use of *mixtus* is particularly frequent in Ovid; cf. *Met.* 8.674, *hic nux, hic mixta est rugosis carica palmis*; 11.595, *nebulae caligine mixtae*; 12.54, *mixtaque cum veris passim commenta vagantur*; 256, *cumque atro mixtos sputantem sanguine dentes*; 14.216, *mixta frondibus herbae*; 255, *mille lupi mixtique lupis ursique leaeque* (with Bömer 93); 606, *ambrosia cum dulci nectare mixta.*

mero: strictly "pure wine", through ellipsis of the expression *(vinum) merum.* Wine for sacrifices had to be pure, that is, unmixed with water (*vinum non mixtum*); cf. Fest. 474.31 ff. L. (= 348.19 ff. M.), *spurcum vinum est quod sacris adhiberi non licet, ut ait Labeo Antistius lib. X commentari iuris pontificii, cui aqua admixta est defrutumve, aut igne tactum est, mustumve antequam defervescat*; Plin. *Nat.* 14.119; Isid. *Or.* 20.3.7; Nisbet-Hubbard 243 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 1.19.15. For the adjective *merus* qualifying wine, cf. *ThLL* 8.846.50–67; for its substantivized use, equivalent by ellipsis to *vinum merum*, cf. *ThLL* 8.848.67–849.50; for *merum* in religious ceremonies or superstitious rites, cf. *ThLL* 8.849.79 ff.

VI

Lygdamus seeks to drown the pains of love in wine. This element of conviviality leaves its own special stamp on this elegy within the cycle. Unlike the others, it is not static, but dynamic; that is, the argument does not follow a rational, pre-established plan, but rather the poet gives in to the untrammelled emotion of his *ingenium*. The effect sought here is that of imitating and reproducing the disordered coming and going of thoughts and words which indicates that an individual is under the influence of wine.

The poem begins with an invocation to the god Bacchus, requesting that he come to help the poet with his gift of wine. Line 4 makes it clear that the sorrow Lygdamus wishes to drown in wine has been brought on by love. The poet then orders a servant to pour out Falernian wine in abundance, and encourages his friends to follow his example. The situation is now clear: we are at the initial stages of a dinner-party.

In the course of the elegy we are witness to a bitter combat between love and wine, first through their respective gods, Bacchus and Amor, whose rivalry is already pointed to in l. 4 and whose respective powers are contrasted in ll. 13–24; then by means of the exhortations to enjoy the feast, alternating with the thoughts of love which obsessively return, only to be driven off again. Finally, after an instant when the memory of love appears to triumph, a moment symbolized by the watered-down wine (ll. 53–58), the partying spirit overcomes the pains of love, the wine is served unwatered and Lygdamus calls for the attributes characteristic of this type of social occasion, perfume for the hair and a garland of flowers.

The sympotic song had enjoyed a long tradition in Greek poetry, both archaic and Hellenistic. The *locus classicus* for an account of all the paraphernalia of the archaic Greek symposium, which was originally of a ritual nature, is undoubtedly fragment 1 W. of Xenophanes (= 1 D.), which contains exhaustive descriptions of such characteristic topoi of the *apparatus convivii* as the preparation of the venue, the garlands, the perfume, the plentiful supply of wine, the pure water for mixing, a simple menu (cheese, honey and bread), the hymn to Bacchus, the ritual libation and the exhortation to drink

in moderation; cf. P. von der Müll, "Il simposio greco", in M. Vetta (ed.), J. Trumpf (transl.), *Poesia e simposio nella Grecia Antica: guida storica e critica*, Roma-Bari 1983, pp. 5–28. A symposiastic atmosphere is also to be found in some fragments of Anacreon (eg *Fr.* 27 and 43 Diehl). In Roman literature, famous symposiastic precedents are Catul. 27, as well as two odes by Horace, the Roman poet who undoubtedly best adapted the sympotic topoi from archaic and Hellenistic Greek literature (cf. Williams, *Trad. & Orig.*, p. 126), namely: *Od.* 2.3.13–16 and 2.11.13–14, both in the *carpe diem* framework. In Latin elegy, too, sympotic elements can be found, though not in great abundance; in addition, the elegists use these topoi somewhat differently from Horace; cf. R. Mª Marina Sáez, "El elemento simposíaco en la elegía latina", *Actas del VIII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*, Madrid 1994, pp. 727–735. Only Lygd. 6 brings together a sufficient number of sympotic topoi to enable it to be considered a direct continuation of the tradition: ritual invocation to Liber, order to the slave in charge of serving, *arbiter bibendi*, exhortation to the *amici* to drink, repudiation of *curae*, garlands of flowers, perfume, mixing of wine with water. As in the other elegists, and unlike Horace, in Lygdamus the symposium is simply an ideal setting in which to give expression to an amorous conflict, and not an end in itself.

The unhappy lover drinking unmixed wine to forget his misfortune is already mentioned in Hellenistic epigram; cf. *AP* 12.50 (Asclep.); and *AP* 12.49 (Mel.), especially ll. 3–4:

ζωροπότει καὶ πλῆρες ἀθυσσάμενος σκύθοζ οἴνας
ἔκκρουσον στυγερὰν ἐκ κραδίας ὀδύναν.

In fact, it is with the Alexandrians that the old sympotic motif of "drowning one's sorrows in wine" (eg Thgn. 879–880; Anacr. 43; 46; 48 Bergk; Alc. 38; 335; 346 L.-P.; Nisbet-Hubbard 230–231 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 1.18.4) takes a specifically erotic twist and becomes an amatory topos; cf. G. Giangrande, "Sympotic Literature and Epigram", in *L'Épigramme grecque*, Fondation Hardt Entretiens 14 (Vandoeuvres-Genève 1967) 129, n. 1.

In Roman literature, there is the precedent of Tib. 1.2.1–4, where the poet exhorts himself to drown his love-induced woes in alcohol:

Adde merum vinoque novos compesce dolores,
occupet ut fessi lumina victa sopor,
Neu quisquam multo percussum tempora baccho
excitet, infelix dum requiescit amor.

And a frustrated attempt to apply the therapeutic power of wine is mentioned in Tib. 1.5.37–38:

Saepe ego temptavi curas depellere vino,
at dolor in lacrimas verterat omne merum.

In Prop. 3.17.3–4 the motif of wine as a *remedium amoris* forms part, as in Lygdamus, of a hymn to Bacchus:

Tu potes insanae Veneris compescere fastus,
curarumque tuo fit medicina mero.

For a comparison of the epigram of Meleager with Prop. 3.17 and Tib. 1.2, cf. F. Jacoby, "Zur Entstehung der römischen Elegie", *RhM* 60 (1905) 89–96 (= *Kleine philologische Schriften* [Berlin 1961] 2.108–114). M. Rothstein, *Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius* (Berlin 1924), pointed to the similarities between Prop. 3.17.3 and the beginning of Tib. 1.2 and Lygd. 6.

Ovid, for his part, adheres to the opposite theory, which regards wine as a stimulant of love, rather than a source of consolation. Cf. *Her.* 16 (*Paris Helenae*) 231–232:

Saepe mero volui flammam compescere, at illa
crevit et ebrietas ignis in igne fuit.

Cf. also *Ars* 1.229–244 (especially ll. 237, *vina parant animos faciuntque caloribus aptos*; and 244, *et Venus in vinis ignis in igne fuit*).

At the end of the *Remedia*, Ovid advises those who wish to forget about an affair either not to drink at all or to do so in great quantities, in order to numb the senses (ll. 809–810):

Aut nulla ebrietas, aut tanta sit, ut tibi curas
eripiat: siquast inter utrumque, nocet.

He had previously explained the reason for this extreme attitude regarding wine-drinking (ll. 805–806):

Vina parant animum Veneri, nisi plurima sumas,
et stupeant multo corda sepulta mero.

There was, in fact, a whole literary tradition sustaining the commonplace of drunkenness and erotic arousal. The aphrodisiac power of wine as a literary motif goes as far back as the Homeric poems: Hom. *Od.* 21.295, where excessive imbibing of wine is described as acting as an aphrodisiac for the Centaurs, is the oldest example in literature; cf. also E. *Ba.* 773, οἴνου δὲ μεκέτ' ὄντος οὐκ ἔστιν Κύπρις

(on the survival of this proverbial expression, cf. Ter. *Eun.* 733, *sine Cerere et Libero friget Venus*, and numerous *loci similes* in Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 366 s.v. *Venus* [1868]); Anacr. *Fr.* 12 P. 1–4, where Dionysus is alluded to by means of a long periphrasis, "lord with whom triumphant Eros, the dark-eyed nymphs and rosy-faced Aphrodite play", a phrase summing up the connection between wine and sensual pleasure; 51 P. (= fr. 38 Gent.), where the relationship between drunkenness and love-making is obvious; *AP* 5.167 (Asclep.), 12.118 (Call.) and 12.120 (Posidipp.), a variant on the popular motif of drunkenness and amorous arousal; Prop. 1.3.13–16 (following the Callimachean model), *et quamvis duplici correptum ardore iuberent / hac Amor hac Liber, durus uterque deus, / subiecto leviter positam* (scil. *Cynthiam*) *temptare lacerto, / osculaque admota sumere et arma manu, / . . .*; Ov. *Am.* 1.6.59–60; *AP* 5.93 (Rufin.); Ach. Tat. 2.3.3; *AL* 710.3–4, *ardenti Baccho succenditur ignis amoris, / nam sunt unanimi Bacchus Amorque dei.* See also Giangrande, *op. cit*, pp. 114–115; 127–128; Pease *ad* Cic. *Nat.* 2.60; Kay 74–75 *ad* Mart. 11.6.12 (*possum nil ego sobrius*); T. Hopfner, *Das Sexualleben der Griechischen und Römer* (1938) 295–296; Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 372 s.v. *vinum* 1 and 4.

On the other hand, for drunkenness and neat wine as an anti-aphrodisiac (*remedium amoris*), cf. also Mart. 1.106. Citroni 323 *ad loc.* also cites Arist. *Pr.* 3.11, Διὰ τί οἱ νεθύοντες ἀθροδισιάζειν ἀδύνατοί εἰσι; *Ath.* 10.434–435; Macr. *Sat.* 7.6.8. Howell (326 *ad* Mart. 1.107) adds Mart. 8.50.23–26, *si Telethusa venit promissaque gaudia portat, / servabor dominae, Rufe, triente tuo; / si dubia est, septunce* (scil. *Istanti*) *trahar; si fallit amantem, / ut iugulem curas, nomen utrumque bibam.*

We thus have two parallel literary treatments of the virtues of wine in relation to love, as a stimulant and as a *remedium.* In the aretalogies of Bacchus, both aspects of this twofold power of the god are praised (cf. Prop. 3.17.5, *per te iungitur, per te solvuntur amantes* [scil. *Bacche*]).

As regards the invocation to the god Bacchus, this Lygdamean example takes its place within an ancient tradition dating back to the Homeric hymn to Dionysus.

In the fragment of Anacr. 12 P. the poet calls upon Dionysus to help him, so that Cleobulus will accept his love. For the first time the god of wine appears in connection with the poet's amorous passion. This is the oldest precedent of a hymn to Bacchus with erotic content.

Praise of the god of wine and mystic inspiration was later developed in numerous dithyrambs, and the account of his feats was widely

echoed in tragedy from Aeschylus to Euripides (for example, in the *Lycurgeia* of Aeschylus and the *Bacchae* of Euripides).

Among the Romans, the Augustan poets frequently sang the praises of Bacchus. Horace composed two Bacchic poems, *Odes* 19 and 3.25, which, though lacking any erotic content, established the image of this god as a deity of poetry and served as an obligatory model for future Bacchic hymns (cf. Ov. *Fasti* 3.713–790).

Among the elegiac poets, Propertius had already sung a hymn to Bacchus in the hope that his wine would cure him (*remedium amoris*) of his love sickness (3.17). M. Hubbard, in *Propertius* [New York 1975] 72, expressed what has come to be the *communis opinio* on this elegy of Propertius: "the hymn to Bacchus (3.17) is an elegiac rehandling of themes in Horace's two Bacchic poems (i.e., *Odes* 2.19 and 3.25)". On the Propertian hymn to Bacchus, cf. also R. J. Littlewood, "Two Elegiac Hymns: Propertius, 3.17 and Ovid, *Fasti*, 5.663–692", *Latomus* 34 (1975) 662–674; M. Swoboda, "De Propertii elegiis hymnos imitantibus", *Eos* 65 (1977) 131–138; R. O. A. M. Lyne, *The Latin Love Poets from Catullus to Ovid* (Oxford 1980) 138; P. Fedeli, *Properzio. Il libro terzo delle Elegie* (Bari 1985) 512–515; J. F. Miller, "Propertius' Hymn to Bacchus and Contemporary Poetry", *AJPh* 112 (1991) 77–86. Horatian influence aside, what is new in Propertius is his rehandling of the hymn to Bacchus as a specifically erotic motif, which links him directly to Anacreon. This characteristic, together with the previously-mentioned detail of the explicit reference to wine, the gift of Bacchus, as a *remedium amoris*—in Anacreon, in contrast, it is implicit, and moreover, wine is considered an *incitamentum amoris*—, make this elegy of Propertius the closest model for Lygdamus. Prop. 3.17 sees a coming together of the two traditions, the hymn to Dionysus and the sympotic motif of "drowning one's sorrows in wine", both of them in connection with amorous passion. Unlike Anacreon, whose hymn to Dionysus seeks the aid of the god to secure requited love and is based on the notion of wine as an aphrodisiac, Propertius and Lygdamus, although in the erotic use of the hymn to Bacchus they are following the precedent of archaic Greek lyric poetry, are, as regards the ultimate intention of their respective Bacchic hymns—to forget an unrequited love—diametrically opposed to Anacreon, since they are working from the opposite notion of wine as a *remedium amoris*. On the commonplace of the appeal to the god of wine as a *remedium amoris*, cf. F. Solmsen, *CPh* 57 (1962) 76; C. Macleod, *CQ* 68 (1974) 91.

Finally, the exiled Ovid, too, had the happy idea of inserting a hymn to Bacchus, pleading for his help to alleviate his sorrows, within the setting of a banquet in honour of the god (*Tr.* 5.3). Like Lygdamus, Ovid at the end of the poem appeals to his friends to remember him and help him (ll. 47–52). But unlike the case of Lygdamus, in Ovid the social setting is not a real banquet taking place before our very eyes, but simply a nostalgic evocation of the dinner-party he imagines his friends to be holding in Rome on the day on which he is writing to them, March 17th, the festivity of the *Liberalia*, when the College of poets used to honour Bacchus, its patron. In Lygdamus, this logical connection is missing. Although the erotic note is absent from Ovid, the idea of a hymn pleading for the assistance of Bacchus in a symposium setting is in fact Ovidian.

As regards the ambience of *sodalicium* which can clearly be detected in this elegy, Lygdamus is closer to Propertius and Horace than to Tibullus, whose poetry is characterized by a self-obsessed intimacy: «D'une manière générale, il semble que les amis ont moins compté pour lui (scil. Tibulle) que pour Properce ou Horace. Ses élégies ne comportent aucun de ces vocatifs familiers à Properce et surtout à Horace, *amici* et *sodales*, et dans aucun des moments douloureux qu'il a vécus le poète ne réclame de l'amitié son rôle consolateur. Ainsi lorsque malade à Corcyre il gémit sur sa solitude, il fait appel à sa mère, à sa soeur, à Délie, non à ses amis (A. Sauvage, "Tibulle et son temps", *Latomus* 28 [1969] 887)».

* * *

1–12: sacrificial ritual to the god Bacchus: cletic hymn (ll. 1–4); libation (ll. 5–6); rejection of anything that might pollute the ceremony (ll. 7–8); curse on all who refuse to participate in it (ll. 11–12). The ritual ceremony in honour of Bacchus takes on the overtones of a banquet.

1–4: cletic hymn with the traditional structure of invocation (ll. 1–2), supplication (l. 3) and aretalogy (l. 4). For the generic composition of a hymn, see Men. Rh. 334.25–336.4 and the studies by Norden, *Agnostos Theos* 143–163; Appel, *De Roman. precationibus* 53–218; Cairns, *Generic Composition* 192–196; Nisbet-Hubbard I 343–344 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 1.30. The prime objective of a cletic hymn is to secure the appearance or epiphany (*praesentia*, παρουσία) of the god.

1–2: ritual invocation to Bacchus calling for him to appear. As regards the content, it is remarkably similar to Tib. 2.1.3–4, *Bacche, veni, dulciaque tuis e cornibus uva / pendeat, et spicis tempora cinge, Ceres.* As for the formulation, part of the ritual invocation is the formula requesting the epiphany of the god (*ades*) and the common asseverative formula *sic tibi*. . .; cf. Tib. 1.4.1, *sic umbrosa tibi contingant tecta, Priape*; 7.53–54, *sic venias hodierne, tibi dem turis honores / liba et Mopsopio dulcia melle feram*; 2.5.121–122, *adnue! sic tibi sint intonsi, Phoebe, capilli / sic tua perpetuo sit tibi casta soror*; Ov. *Tr.* 5.3.35–43, *fer, bone Liber, opem: sic altera* (: *altam*) *degravet ulmum / vitis et incluso plena sit uva mero, / sic tibi cum bacchis Satyrorum gnava iuventus / assit et attonito non taceare sono; / ossa bipenniferi sic sint male pressa Lycurgi, / impia nec poena Pentheos umbra vacet; sic micet aeternum vicinaque sidera vincat / coniugis in caelo Cressa corona tuae: / huc ades et casus releves, pulcherrime, nostros*; Mart. 4.45.5–8, *fac* (scil. *Phoebus*) *rata vota patris: sic te tua diligat arbor* (ie *laurus*) */ gaudeat et certa virginitate soror* (ie *Diana*), */ perpetuo sic flore mices, sic denique non sint / tam longae Bromio* (ie *Baccho*) *quam tibi, Phoebe, comae*; see also *loci cit.* in comm. *ad* ll. 1b–2 *sic sit tibi.* The poem of Ovid cited is strikingly similar as regards the situation, since Ovid not only asks Bacchus for help and relief from his suffering, but also addresses his friends, who have come together at a dinner-party to celebrate the *Liberalia*, asking them to pray for him and not to forget him (ll. 47–52). Note the alliteration in the 2nd half of the hexameter.

As for the text, the pentameter (l. 2) presents serious difficulties at two points where the ms. tradition does not agree: the first hemistich and the last words of the pentameter (cf. G. Castelli, "Note a *Corp. Tibull.* 6.2, *RSC* 21 [1973] 114–116):

I) in the first hemistich the reading *semper sic hedera* from the best ms. tradition (*AGV*) is to be preferred to the inverted order *sic hedera semper* of a few codices (mainly *HPQ*), for linguistic as well as for paleographic reasons: placing *semper* at the beginning of the line permits enjambement with l. 1 (*sic sit tibi rustica vitis / semper*), a rhetorical device that is very much to Lygdamus' liking (see statistics at Lygd. 1.26–27 [comm.]); moreover, the simple alliteration ***semper, sic*** which results from this continues the more complex alliteration of the previous line, where *si* sibilant groups (***sic sit*** *tibi rustica* ***vitis***) alternate with the equally sonorous *ti* groups (*sic* ***sit tibi*** ***rustica vitis***), alongside the abrupt initial cacophony of *sic sit tibi.*

II) Most of the mss. have *feras*, a few *geras* (particularly the authoritative *G*). Editors also disagree (*feras* Muretus, Ach. Statius,

Lachmann, Postgate, Cartault, Lenz-Galinsky, Ponchont, Tränkle, Lee : *geras* Broukhusius, Vulpius, Heyne-Wunderlich, Dissen, Baehrens, Luck). In support of *geras*, in the sense of "to wear, to have", which is quite frequent in relation to clothing and parts of the body, cf. eg Hor. *Sat.* 1.1.110, *quodque aliena capella gerat distentius uber*; Verg. *Aen.* 6.772, *umbrata gerunt civili tempora quercu*; Tib. 1.3.66, *gerit insigni myrtea serta coma*; 8.7, *at te victrices lauros, Messala, gerentem.* However, the reading *feras* is supported not only by the argument of the majority of the important mss. but also by the fact that it is the *lectio difficilior* and that *fero*, too, is used in direct extensions of the lexical field of the parts of the body, and generally with adjectives and participles; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.189–190, *ductoresque primum capita alta ferentis / cornibus arboreis sternit*; 3.678, *Aetnaeos fratres, caelo capita alta ferentis*; Ov. *Ponto* 2.2.80, (scil. *Caesar Augustus*) *tempora Phoebea virgine nexa tulit*; *ThLL* 6.1.531.15 and 30 ff.; cf. also Ov. *Fasti* 1.393, *corymbiferi . . . Bacchi.*

In addition, a temptingly elegant reading is *cornua*, in place of the traditional *tempora*, as found in the *editio Aldina* of Ach. Statius. As god of wild and uncontrolled vitality, Bacchus was often represented with the horns of a bull (symbol of strength) or a billy goat (symbol of sexual potency). Moreover, according to mythical tradition, his father Jupiter transformed him when young into a kid to save him from the wrath of Juno; and in the *Bacchae* of Euripides, Dionysus is presented in the form of a bull. On horns as an attribute of Bacchus, cf. Plu. *CG* 36 p. 299 B.; S. *Fr.* 607; 874; Ar. *Ra.* 357; E. *Ba.* 100; 1017; Hor. *Od.* 2.19.29 (with Nisbet-Hubbard 330–331); Tib. 2.1.3 (with Smith 394); Prop. 3.17.19; Ov. *Am.* 3.15.17 (with V. Cristóbal 345 n. 138); *Her.* 15 (= *Ep. Sapphos ad Phaonem*).24; *Ars* 1.232 (with Hollis 84–85); 3.348; *Met.* 4.19; *Fasti* 2.177 (with Bömer 198); 3.789; Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.62; Nemes. *Ecl.* 3.36; M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der Griechische Religion* I (1961^2) 569–570; *ThLL* 4.966.52 ff.

Castelli (*art. cit.*, p. 116) seems to opt for the reading *cincta* instead of the traditional *vincta*, but without arguing his case.

1 candide Liber: the adjective *candidus* alludes here to the radiant youthful beauty of the god (= *pulcher*). For the phrase, cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.18.11, *candide Bassareu* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 234); Ov. *Fasti* 3.772, *candide Bacche*; cf. also Ov. *Met.* 4.18, *tu formosissimus*; *Tr.* 5.3.43, *pulcherrime*; Sen. *Oed.* 508, *candida formosi venerabimur ora Lyaei*; *AP* 9.524.2 (Anon.), ἀγλαόμορφον. On the youthful beauty of this god, see the commentary on Lygd. 4.27, *intonsi crines* and Catul. 68.133–134,

Cupido / fulgebat . . . candidus. For *candidus* applied to gods and goddesses, cf. *ThLL* 3.241.36–46.

Liber: *Liber* (Gr. Ἐλεύθερος) is another of the *cognomina* of Bacchus, like *Lyaeus* ("he who unties", cf. Lygd. 2.19) and *Lenaeus* ("the one <the god> of the wine-press or tub", cf. Lygd. 6.28); on the etymology, cf. Serv. *Ge.* 1.166, *Liber pater . . . animas purgat, unde et Liber ab eo, quod liberat, dictus est*; Fulg. *Myth.* 2.12 p. 53.8, *Liber . . . pater dictus est, quod vini passio liberas mentes facit.* The epithet *Liber* reappears in l. 19. Originally, *Liber* or *Liber Pater* was an ancient Roman deity with Italic roots, a god of nature and vegetation; as such, he presided over the fertility of the countryside and the festival in his honour (*Liberalia*) was celebrated on March 17th, when adolescents would lay aside the *toga praetexta* and put on the *toga virilis*. It was not until a later date, after confusion with Iacchus-Dionysus (no doubt facilitated by the equation Ἐλεύθερος = *Liber*) that *Liber Pater* became god of the vineyard workers. On *Liber*, cf. Schur, *RE* 13.68 ff.; Roscher II 2021 ff.; Wissowa, *RuK*² 298 ff.; F. Altheim, *Terra Mater*, *RVV* 22.2 (Giessen 1931) 17 ff.; Guirand, *Mitología General*, p. 279; Grimal, *Mitología*, p. 318; Walde-Hofmann, *LEW* I, p. 792; Maltby, *LALE*, p. 337; A. Bruhl, *Liber Pater, origine et expression du culte dionysiaque à Rome et dans le monde romain*, *Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome* 175 (Paris: De Boccard, 1953), especially chapter I: "Le problème du *Liber Pater* italique", pp. 13–29); F. Bömer, *Untersuchungen über d. Rel. d. Sklaven* I (1957) 115 ff.; *Ovids Fasten* II, pp. 178 and 193. On the god Bacchus in general, see the commentary on Lygd. 4.44.

ades: ie *huc ades* (= ἔλθε δεῦρο; eg Ar. *Th.* 319), a ritual formula in a cletic hymn to invite a god to appear (παρουσία); cf. eg Tib. 1.7.49–50, *huc ades et Genium ludis centumque* (*Geniumque* Markland) *choreis / concelebra et multo tempora funde merum*; 2.1.35 (Tibullus invokes divine Messala), *huc ades aspiraque mihi* (with Murgatroyd 39–40); Ov. *Am.* 3.2.46, *huc ades et meus hic fac, dea, vincat amor!* Imperatives or jussive subjunctives like ἔλθε, βαῖνε, ἱκοῦ, μόγε, *veni(as)*, *adi* (*adeas*), *fer(te) pedem* are key expressions in the cletic hymn; cf. Catul. 61.9, *huc veni* (with Fedeli 23); Hor. *Od.* 1.2.30, *tandem venias* (scil. *Apollo*) *precamus* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 29); Verg. *Ge.* 1.18, *adsis* (with Thomas 71–72); 2.7; *Aen.* 1.734, *adsit laetitiae Bacchus dator et bona Iuno*; Tib. 1.7.49, *huc ades*; 53; 10.67; 2.1.3, *Bacche, veni* (with Murgatroyd 23–24); 35 *sup. cit.*; 81; 5.2, 6, 7; [Tib.] 3.10(= 4.4).1–2; 12(= 4.6).13; Ov. *Am.* 1.6.54 (con McKeown 150); 2.12.16; 3.2.46; *Met.* 3.613; 7.198; 8.598, *huc ades!*; 10.673; *Fasti* 1.65–67, *Iane biceps . . . / . . . / dexter ades ducibus*

(with Bömer 14); Sen. *Ag.* 348, *ades* (with Tarrant 239–240); Stat. *Silv.* 2.1.227, *ades huc* (with Van Dam 183); 3.1.28 *huc ades* (with Laguna 138); 39, *pacatus mitisque veni* (with Laguna 142); 5.4.16, *inde veni*; *Theb.* 9.548, *ades o mihi* (with Dewar 162); Appel, *De Roman. precationibus* 115–117; Norden, *Agnostos Theos* 148; P. Pöstgens, *Tibulls Ambarvalgedicht*, Würzburg 1940, p. 2 n. 6 (*veni*) and p. 17 n. 46 (*huc ades*); Diehl, *ThLL* 2.917.47 ff.; 923.83 ff.; for Greek examples, cf. Tarrant 239–240 *ad* Sen. *Ag.* 348.

1b–2 sic sit tibi rustica vitis / . . .: cf. Ov. *Tr.* 5.3.35–36, *fer, bone Liber, opem: sic altera degravet ulmum / vitis et incluso plena sit uva mero.* This is a well-known formula for oaths (or asseverations), typical of religious language, in which *sic* ("on this condition") and an imperative or optative subjunctive are followed by an *exemplum* demonstrating the merits of the supplicant in relation to the deity invoked, or at least presenting an argument that will be pleasing to the god, such as an allusion to his divine attributes. The objective in any case is to move the deity so that he will listen to the supplicant's prayers. The religious formula is closely linked to legal practice, as shown by Appel (*De Roman. precationibus*, p. 149): "videmus ad obligationem magicam accessisse obligationem quandam iuridicam dando et accipiendo contractam. Tali enim prece, id quod summi momenti est, contineri apparet opinionem deos, cum antea acceperint beneficia venerationem munera, nunc ex ipso iure esse obligatos, ut invicem optata praestent". For examples of the asseverative formula, apart from the *loci sup. cit.* (cf. comm. on ll. 1–2), cf. Catul. 45.13–16; Verg. *Ecl.* 9.30–31; Hor. *Od.* 1.3.1–2; Tib. 2.5.63–64 (with Murgatroyd 205); 121–122 (with Murgatroyd 235); Prop. 1.18.11, where Propertius adapts the formula to exhort the deified Cynthia (with Fedeli 425); 3.6.2; Mart. 7.93.7–8; Ov. *Her.* 3.135–136; 4.168 ff.; *Met.* 8.857; *Ponto* 2.6.15 ff.; Fordyce 141–142 *ad* Catul. 17.5; Kiessling-Heinze 20–21 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 1.3.1; for other post-Ovidian *loci*, cf. Appel, *ibid.*, p. 152.

1 sic sit tibi: J. Wackernagel (*Kl. Schr.* I 78–79) showed that in asseverative formulae introduced by the particles *ita*, *sic*, *itaque*, *utinam*, *hercle* and similar, both in archaic and in classical Latin, the pronoun as a general rule comes immediately after the particle; cf. Catul. 17.5, *sic tibi bonus e tua pons libidine fiat*; Verg. *Ecl.* 10.4–5, *sic tibi, cum fluctus supterlabere Sicanos, / Doris amara suam non intermisceat undam*; Hor. *Od.* 1.3.1 ff., *sic te diva potens Cypri / (. . .) regat*; Prop. 1.18.11, *sic mihi te referas* . . . (with Fedeli 425); 3.6.2, *sic tibi sint dominae, Lygdame, dempta iuga*; Ov. *Her.* 4.169. Exceptions are few and far between: apart from

the present passage of Lygdamus, cf. Tib. 1.4.1, *sic umbrosa tibi contingant tecta, Priape*; Ov. *Met.* 8.857–858, *sic mare compositum, sic sit tibi piscis in unda*; Petr. *Satyr.* 61.2, *sic felicem me videas.* For the optative subjunctive *sit*, cf. Kühner-Stegmann II.1.186.

rustica vitis: the adjective *mysticus* transmitted by the bulk of the mss. raises serious problems. Before the 4th c. AD *mysticus* is attested in a very small number of examples (first in Acc. *Trag.* 688 R) and always applied to objects, sacrifices or teachings related to secret cults (thus called mystery cults); cf. Verg. *Ge.* 1.166, *mystica vannus Iacchi* (in connection with Eleusis); Ov. *Her.* 2.42, *taediferae mystica sacra deae*, referring to Ceres Eleusina; Mart. 8.81.1, *mystica sacra Dindymenes*; Stat. *Theb.* 8.765–766. The adjective *mysticus* in Lygdamus would thus refer to a presumably important role of the vine in the Dionysian mysteries. The problem is that there is no real evidence of such a role (with the possible exception of Ov. *Met.* 6.592, *vite caput tegitur*, referring to Progne on the occasion of the celebration of the biennial festival in honour of Bacchus). Another possibility is to take *mystica vites* as a similar expression to *sacra vites* (cf. Enn. *Scen.* 124 V. = 121 J., *Lyaeus vitis inventor sacrae*; Hor. *Od.* 1.18.1, with Nisbet-Hubbard 229, who cite Hom. *Od.* 13.372, ἱερῆς παρὰ πυθμέν' ἐλαίης; E. *Fr.* 765, οἰνάνθα τρέφει τὸν ἱερὸν βότρυν). However, why not *rustica* (> *mistica* ω > *mystica* $B^2DE_2O^2$)? The paleographic confusion between *rustica* and *mistica* is attested in Tib. 1.10.26 (*rustica* AV, Lenz-Galinsky, Luck : *mistica* Q : *mystica* G [sed *my* i. ras. G^2], Muretus). Broukhusius (*Variarum lectionum libellum*, p. 432) reports of two mss. with the reading *rustica*. The solution *candida vitis* of some *edd. vett.* (eg *edd. pr. mai. 1472 et Vicentina 1481*) lacks both manuscript backing and paleographical logic. For the connection between the vine and Bacchus, cf. eg Verg. *Ecl.* 6.61, *gratissima vitis Iaccho.*

2 hedera: ivy was a plant sacred to Bacchus and therefore linked to his cult. When Juno in her jealousy was searching for the young Bacchus, determined to do away with him, the nymphs of Nysa, whom Jupiter had entrusted with his upbringing, hid him by scattering ivy leaves on his cot; from then on, this plant was pleasing to the god (cf. Ov. *Fasti* 3.769–772). On Bacchus' crown of ivy, cf. Pi. *O.* 2.27, παῖδα κισσοφόρον (cf. Ar. *Th.* 988; *BCH* 50.240 [Thasos, 3rd–2nd c. BC]; 529 [Marathon, 2nd c. AD]; Liddell-Scott 954 s.v.); Ov. *Fasti* 3.483, *Bacche, racemiferos hedera redimite capillos*; 769–772, *hedera est gratissima Baccho . . .*; Sen. *Oed.* 414; Nemes. *Ecl.* 3.18. Garlands of ivy adorned and crowned the heads of priests and public at festivals and

rituals in honour of this god, especially soothsayers and poets, since Bacchus—like Apollo—was god of prophetic and poetical inspiration; cf. Varro *Lat.* 6.14; Hor. *Od.* 1.1.29–30, *me doctarum hederae praemia frontium / dis miscent superis*; Verg. *Ecl.* 7.25, *pastores, hedera crescentem ornate poetam / Arcades*; Prop. 3.3.35; 4.1.62, *mi folia ex hedera porrige, Bacche, tua*; Ov. *Met.* 5.338–339, *inmissos hedera collecta capillos / Calliope*; *Tr.* 5.3.15, *sacris hederae cultoribus* (scil. *poetis*); Plin. *Nat.* 16.9; Stat. *Theb.* 12.623.

3: this line as it has come down to us (*aufer et ipse meum pariter medicando dolorem*) presents serious problems which raise doubts concerning the correct reading. Metrically, although the final short vowel of *medicando* is normal in Silver Latin (cf. Sen. *Tro.* 264, *vincendŏ*; *Oed.* 942, *solvendŏ*; Juv. 3.232, *vigilandŏ*), *pariter* in no way makes any sense. Few editors have resigned themselves to the text as transmitted (Muretus, Lachmann, Lee), and most have tried their luck with their own conjectures. The earliest emendation to the text is the work of Ach. Statius (*medicande*), in an attempt to give full meaning to *ipse* (Broukhusius, Vulpius, Heyne, Dissen, Cartault, Ponchont subsequently accepting it). However, the emendations which enjoy the widest acceptance are: 1) *patera medicare* ("take my sorrows far away and cure them with your cup"), a conjecture by Birt accepted by Tränkle, among others; 2) *patera medicante* ("come . . . / and remove my sorrows with your medicinal cup"), a conjecture by Waardenburg and preferred by most modern editors. Separate mention must be made of the reading proposed for the line by Wacker, followed by Luck (*affer et ipse merum, Pater, et medicare dolorem*), which is far removed from the tradition.

In the plastic arts, Bacchus grasps the thyrsus in one hand, while in the other he holds a bunch of grapes or a cup. For the 'medicinal' role of Bacchus, cf. Prop. 3.17.3–4, *tu potes insanae Veneris compescere fastus, / curarumque tuo fit medicina mero*; 6, *tu vitium ex animo dilue, Bacche, mero*; for the content, cf. also Tib. 1.2.1, *vino . . . novos compesce dolores/*. For wine in Roman medical tradition, cf. C. Real Torres, "El vino como alimento y medicina en la sociedad romana", *Fortunatae* 3 (1992) 305–314. On love as a *morbus*, and the *medicina* with which to cure it, cf. A. La Penna, "Note sul linguaggio erotico dell'elegia latina", *Maia* 4 (1951) 206–207; G. Giangrande, "Symptoms of Love in Theocritus and Ovid", *Analecta Malacitana* 13.1 (1990) 121–123.

patera medicante: for "medicinal cup", cf. Mart. 9.94.1, *Sardonica medicata dedit mihi pocula virga / . . . Hippocrates.*

patera: with the exception of Virgil's *Aeneid* (12 times: 1.729; 739; 3.67; 355; 4.60; 5.91; 98; 775; 6.249; 7.133; 8.640; 12.174; also *Ge.* 2.192), the word *patera*, which is attested from Plautus onwards (eg *Amph.* 260), is not a very frequent term among the Latin poets, who prefer *pocula*: Lucr. 0; Hor. 6 (*Od.* 1.19.15; 31.2; 4.5.34; 8.1; *Sat.* 1.6.118; *Ep.* 1.16.30); Tib. 0; [Tib.] 0; Prop. 1 (4.6.85, *sic noctem patera, sic ducam carmine*); Ov. 4 (*Met.* 9.160; 13.704; 15.575; *Fasti* 4.934); Val.-Flac. 3 (2.348; 3.12; 5.192); Luc. 0; Stat. 3 (*Theb.* 6.211; 10.313; *Ach.* 1.774); Mart. 2 (6.92.2; 8.6.14); in prose, cf. Petr. 1 (*Satyr.* 60.8); Val.-Max. 3 (1.1.ext.3; 1.6.ext.1; 5.6.ext.3. The statistics for Virgil, Ovid and Statius (never in the *Eclogues*, Ovid's *opera amatoria*, or the *Silvae*) suggest that this term has an elevated poetic ring to it, more suited to epic (cf. Val.-Flac.) and tragedy than to elegy and the *genera humilia* (nevertheless, it is not found in Lucan). Most of the occurrences in poetry associate the *patera* with sacred rites (cf. *ThLL* 10.1.693.27 ff.) and describe it as being made of gold (cf. Pl. *Amph.* 260; Acc. *Carm. frg.* 8; Verg. *Ge.* 2.192; *Aen.* 1.729) or silver (cf. Curt. 4.7.24). For the metonymic use of *patera* for the drink contained therein, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.739; 4.60; 7.133; Prop. 4.6.85; Claud. 1.247; *ThLL* 10.1.693.72 ff.

medicante: for the use of *medicare* in connection with amorous passion, cf. Nemes. *Ecl.* 2.28, *medicare furores.*

dolorem: on the elegiac sense of this term, see the commentary on Lygd. 2.3 *dolorem.*

4: aretalogy of the god invoked. For combats between Amor and Bacchus *proelia Bacchi et Veneris*), see Hollis 84 *ad* Ov. *Ars* 1.231–232, *saepe illic positi teneris adducta lacertis / purpureus Bacchi cornua pressit Amor.* As regards the formulation, for the expression *cecidit . . . Amor*, cf. Catul. 11.21–22, *meum . . . amorem / qui illius culpa cecidit*; [Sen.] *Oct.* 564, (*Amor*) *quem si fovere atque alere desistas, cadit*; Sil. 17.361; for *cecidit . . . victus*, cf. Val.-Flac. 1.300, *ubi victa gravi ceciderunt lumina somno*; for *victus Amor*, cf. Tib. 1.5.60, *donis vincitur omnis amor* (a phrase which Putnam 107 considers an inverted variation of Verg. *Ecl.* 10.69, *omnia vincit Amor*); Ov. *Rem.* 260, *nec fugiet vivo sulphure* **victus Amor**/; 462, *successore novo vincitur omnis amor.*

cecidit: for the use of *cadere* in connection with feelings which are waning, cf. Prop. 2.3.1–2, *qui nullam tibi dicebas iam posse nocere, / haesisti:* **cecidit** *spiritus ille tuo* (cf. Pichon, p. 96); *ThLL* 3.26.43 ff. ('res et incorporales et corporea cadunt, i. e. desinunt esse vel decrescunt vel pereunt'). The verb, however, never loses its sense of "to fall defeated,

or dead", characteristic of military contexts, especially in the historians (*ThLL* 3.23.9 ff.).

tuo . . . munere: ie *mero*. For *munus* (or *munera*) applied to wine as the special gift of Bacchus to men, cf. Lygd. 6.17–18 *Bacchi / munera* (comm.).

5–6: exhortation to a young slave to serve good wine in abundant measure (again, in ring-composition form, at the end of the poem, ll. 57 and 62). This may be regarded as the ritual libation in honour of Bacchus. This distich introduces the party atmosphere enveloping the whole elegy. The reference to the cup that is "full to the brim" (*pocula madida*) is a very old sympotic topos, symbolising joy and happiness; cf. Xenoph. 1.4 D., κρατὴρ δ' ἕστηκεν μεστὸς εὐφροσύνης. The formulation of the hexameter seems to echo Prop. 2.33.39–40, *largius* **effusso madeat** *tibi mensa Falerno / spumet et aurato mollius in calice!*

The apostrophe to a servant-slave (*care puer*, l. 5) was a familiar topos in Greek epigram and symposiastic lyric. The theme goes back to Anacreon:

> ἄγε δὴ φέρ' ἡμίν, ὦ παῖ,
> κελέβεν . . . (10.1–2 P.)
>
> Φέρ' ὕδωρ, φέρ' οἶνον, ὦ παῖ, φέρε <δ'> ἀνθεμόεντας ἡμὶν
> στεφάνους ἔνεικον . . . (51.1–2 P.)

The formula was picked up by later poets, who were now writing for a literary public rather than for a symposium: cf. Catul. 27.1–2, *minister vetuli puer Falerni, / inger mi calices amariores*; Hor. *Od.* 2.11.18–20, *quis puer ocius / restinguet ardentis Falerni / pocula praetereunte lympha?*; 3.14.17–18, *i, pete unguentum, puer, et coronas / et cadum Marsi memorem duelli*; *Epod.* 9.33–36, *capaciores affer huc, puer, scyphos / et Chia vina aut Lesbia / vel, quod fluentem nauseam coerceat, metire nobis Caecubum*; Tib. 1.2.1, *adde merum vinoque novos compesce dolores*; Mart. 9.93.1, *addere quid cessas, puer, inmortale Falernum?*; 14.170.2; *AP* 5.110.2 (Marc. Arg.), ἕνα μοι, λάτρι, δίδου, κύαθον. Sometimes the poet addresses the slave and orders him to take charge of the purchases for the feast (cf. Nisbet-Hubbard 421–422 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 1.38).

5 care puer: a phrase frequently attested in poetry from Verg. *Aen.* 8.581 (Evander bidding farewell to his son Pallas as he marches off to do battle). It always carries a strong element of emotion and tenderness; cf. Stat. *Silv.* 5.5 (*epicedion in puerum suum*) 79, *nonne gemam te, care puer?*; *Ach.* 1.252 (*Thetis Achillei*), *si mihi, care puer, thalamos sors aequa dedisset, / quos dabat, aetheriis ego te complexa tenerem / sidus grande plagis.*

In Stat. *Silv.* 3.4.60–63, *care puer superis, qui praelibare verendum / nectar . . . / electus*, the phrase is used, in a similar context to Lygdamus, to refer to Earinus, cupbearer and favourite of Domitian. However, in the context of the *Silva* of Statius there is a convergence of two pregnant senses of the term *puer* (παῖς): a) "(young) slave", here in the role of wine steward or cupbearer. This meaning of *puer* (= *famulus, minister*) is quite an old one, and fairly frequently attested in all periods of Latin from Plautus (cf. Pl. *Mer.* 912; Ter. *Phorm.* 152; Catul. 27.1; Hor. *Od.* 1.38.1 and 2.11.18 (with Nisbet-Hubbard I 424 and II 176); *Sat.* 1.6.116; *Ep.* 1.18.74; Prop. 3.23.23; Sen. *Ep.* 95.23; Petr. *Satyr.* 54.5; 70.8; Mart. 1.41.8; 8.67.1; Juv. 5.61; 11.146; cf. also Lygd. 6.62 n.); b) prepubescent boy, object of a paederastic relationship, Earinus being the favourite at court (= ἐρώμενος, *delicatus*; cf. Stat. *Silv.* 3.4.7, 44, 99; Mart. 11.8.12; 78.4; Bömer 58 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 10.130); the use of *pueri delicati* as wine stewards at banquets is attested as early as *AP* 12.175 (Strat.). Both aspects of the *puer* are skilfully reflected in Mart. 11.26 (with Kay 127). There is no reason to assume—although it cannot be ruled out absolutely—that this double implication is also present in Lygdamus' use of the expression *care puer*, or to infer that there are paederastic implications here, as *care puer* as a form of address could easily have occurred to Lygdamus in view of the tender years of cupbearers.

madeant . . . pocula: "let the cups be soaked", that is, "let them be filled to the brim"; cf. Stat. *Silv.* 2.2.29, *madidas Baccheo nectare rupes*; 3.5.99, *Bacchei vineta madentia Gauri* (with Laguna 388). The verb *madere* (and *madidus*) also suggests drunkenness; then they imply a large amount imbibed and occur only in poetry down to the Augustan period (Plautus, Lucretius, and Tibullus) and mainly in poetry after that; cf. Tib. 2.1.29–30, *non festa luce madere / est rubor* (with Murgatroyd 36–37); 2.8, *madeatque mero* (with Murgatroyd 220–221); 5.87, *madidus Baccho*; Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.41 (on Hercules, brother of Dionysus), *multo fratre madentem*; 4.8.8–9, *plaga cara madenti / Surrentia deo*; *OLD madeo* 3; *ThLL* 8.34.18 ff.; 37.32 ff. For the opposite expression to *pocula madida*, cf. l. 18, *pocula sicca* ("dry cups", that is, "empty"). Like *madidus*, *madere* is a predominantly poetic term: 27 times in Ovid (18 in *Met.* and *Fasti* together); 7 in Virgil (5 in *Aen.*); in Horace, just one instance in the *Odes*; 5 in Tibullus; 2 in Propertius. For the statistics, cf. McKeown 152 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.6.56 (*madere*) and 369 *ad* 1.14.11 (*madidus*).

generoso . . . Baccho: "good wine". The adjective *generosus* ("of good family") is often used to refer to wine ("good quality", "select")

from Hor. *Ep.* 1.15.18, and later attested also in prose; cf. Mart. 13.115, *Caecuba . . . generosa*; *ThLL* 6.2.1801.82 ff.; cf. also Hor. *Od.* 2.14.26–27, *mero . . . superbo*; Lucil. 1131, Χῖός τε δυνάστες; Salv. *Eccl.* 4.33, *Falerno nobili.* In conjunction, however, with the metonymic use of *Bacchus*, it is only found in Ov. *Met.* 4.765, *postquam epulis functi generosi munere Bacchi* (in the same place in the line). For the metonymic use of *Bacchus*, see Lygd. 2.19 *Lyaeo* (comm.); cf. also Lygd. 6.17–18 *Bacchi / munera* (comm.).

pocula Baccho: for the phrase, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3.354, *libabant pocula Bacchi/*; [Verg.] *Cir.* 229, *dulcis pocula Bacchi/* (with Lyne 195); Ov. *Fasti* 3.301; Val.-Flac. 1.260.

6 en . . . funde: "come, pour . . .!". The traditional *et* is not entirely satisfactory, since it would involve a brusque change of subject, number, person and mood between the verbs it linked (*madeant . . . funde*), if it were the correct reading. The conjecture by Scaliger, *i* (cf. l. 62) was fully accepted for some time, although since Lachmann (with the exception of Baehrens) the conservative reading *et* has re-established itself. Completely ignored, however, has been the attractive conjecture *en* (Müller), which an inexpert copyist, failing to understand it, and falling into hypercorrection, could easily have taken as an error of transcription of a previous copyist due to contact with the initial nasal of *nobis*. The use of *en* plus imperative as a formula for encouraging or badgering is widely attested in Latin literature; cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 6.69, *en accipe*; *Ge.* 3.42, *en age segnis rumpe moras*; Tib. 2.2.10, *en age (quid cessas? adnuit ille) roga*; Ov. *Am.* 1.8.31, *en aspice!* (= *Met.* 2.283; Gr. δῆν ἰςού); *Fasti* 3.352, *en audi*; Sen. *Phaed.* 54; Pers. 5.134; Sil. 3.179. On this deictic particle, cf. Hofmann, *Latín familiar*, pp. 47–48 (§ 43); on its frequency and elegiac use, cf. A. Kershaw, "On elegiac *en*", *CQ* 42 (1992) 282–284.

prona funde . . . manu: "pour with hand facing downwards", that is, *large funde. Fundere* is a technical term (*vox propria*); cf. Serv. *Aen.* 6.244, *fundere est supina manu liberare, quod fit in sacris supernis; vergere autem est conversa in sinistram partem manu ita fundere ut patera convertatur, quod in infernis sacris fit*; for its use in connection with sacrifices, cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.31.2–3, *quid orat de patera novum / fundens liquorem?*; Pers. 2.3, *funde merum genio*; *THLL* 6.1.1563, 79–1564.9. In *prona . . . manu* Lygdamus is highlighting the downward twisting of the wrist involved when serving wine. There is a similar image in Hor. *Od.* 3.29.1–5, *tibi / non ante verso lene merum cado / [. . .] / iamdudum apud me est*, where the fact that the amphora has never been tilted indicates that

its wine has never been poured, that is, the amphora is intact. The expression *prona manu*, nevertheless, is quite striking and unusual; hence in his commentary Ach. Statius offered the proverbial *plena manu* as the reading, as found in his *Sfortiae librum*; for this proverbial expression, cf. Hom. *Od.* 11.359; Tib. 1.5.68; 9.52 (cf. also Hom. *Od.* 10.42); cf. E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica* II (Lund 1933) 239; Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 212 s.v. *manus* 17 [1051]; *OLD manus* 18d.

Falerna: a famous wine from the province of Campania. Many different varieties of wine, usually denoted by their place of origin, are listed by the ancient authors (especially Plin. *Nat.* 14; Athenaeus 1–10). Outstanding among Greek wines were those from Chios, Thasos, Lemnos and Cos; among the Romans, the Setine, Caecuban, Falernan and Alban varieties were particularly highly-prized; cf. *OCD* 1138–1139 s.v. 'Wine'. Of all these the best, according to Pliny, was the Falernan (cf. Plin. *Nat.* 14.62, *nec ulli nunc vino maior auctoritas*). In a Pompeian *taberna*, the *Falernum* cost four times as much as an ordinary wine (cf. *CLE* 931). On this point, see W. Younger, *Gods, Men and Wine* (1966), particularly pp. 202–203. To Falernan was usually applied the epithet *vetulus* ("mature"); cf. Catul. 27.1 (with Fordyce 157); Macr. *Sat.* 7.12.9 (*infra cit.*); Mart. 1.18.1 (with Citroni 70–71); 8.77.5; 11.26.3 (with Kay 128); cf. also Tib. 2.1.27, *fumosos veteris . . . Falernos consulis* (with Murgatroyd 35–36); Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.115, *veteris Falerni*, and the expression *inmortale Falernum* in Mart. 9.93.1; 11.36.5 (cf. Stat. *Silv.* 4.2.12; *ThLL* 7.1.495.10); in fact, 15 years was considered the ideal age (cf. Athen. 1.26c; Varro *Rust.* 1.65; Plin. *Nat.* 23.34); Falernian was strong (cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.4.24–26; Plin. *Nat.* 23.36) and could be fiery (Hor. *Od.* 2.11.19) and dry (cf. Nisbet-Hubbard 313–314 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 1.27.9). Martial often describes it as *nigrum*, since it is the darkest type of wine; cf. Mart. 8.55(56).14; 77.5; 9.22.8; 90.5; 11.8.7 (with Kay 84); 49(50).7; *nigrum Falernum* also in *CLE* 29.10. Its excellent bouquet was celebrated by Martial (11.8.7) and Phaedrus (3.1.1–2); as regards its effect on the palate, the *vetulum Falernum* was criticised for not being very sweet (cf. Cic. *Brut.* 287, *sed nimia vetustas nec habet . . . suavitatem nec est iam sane tolerabilis*), as a result of which it is often decribed as *ardens* (eg Hor. *Od.* 2.11.19), *forte*, *severum*, etc. (see Marquardt, *Privatleben*², p. 450); it was therefore often mixed with honey; cf. Macr. *Sat.* 7.12.9, *mulsum quod probe temperes miscendum esse novo Hymettio et vetulo Falerno*; Hor. *Sat.* 2.2.15–16; 4.24–25; Mart. 13.108. Silius Italicus, in book VII of his *Punica*, introduces an aetiological myth explaining the reason for the proverbial excellence of Falernan

wine as a genuine *munera Bacchi*: Bacchus, out of gratitude for hospitality received, rewards his host Falernus with a wine which will henceforth bear his name and guarantee him everlasting fame (ll. 162–211); on this myth, see D. W. T. C. Vessey, "The Myth of Falernus in Silius, *Punica* VII", *CJ* 68 (1972) 240–246.

Unlike archaic Greek lyric, Roman poetry displays considerable interest in the origin of different wines (cf. A. Thill, *Alter ab illo. Recherches sur l'imitation dans la poésie personelle à l'époque augustéenne*, Paris 1979, p. 140), an interest inherited from Hellenistic poetry: Theocritus mentions the wines of Ptelea (7.65) and Biblos (19.15); in the *Anthologia Palatina* a certain predilection can be detected for the wine of Chios (eg *AP* 5.183 [Posidipp.]; 7.422 [Leon.]; 12.108 [Dion.]). Horace mentions an enormous variety of wines, mainly local. In elegy there is rather less variety than in Horace, Falernan being the most frequently-cited wine (Tib. 1.9.33; 2.1.27; Prop. 2.33B.39; 4.6.73; Lygd. 6.6), although Greek wines are also featured, such as those of Chios (Tib. 2.1.28), Lesbos (Prop. 1.14.2), and Methymna (Prop. 4.8.38).

The nominalised use of *Falernum* (*vinum*)—by ellipsis—dates back to Catul. 27.1, *minister vetuli . . . Falerni*. For the expression *funde Falerna manu/*, cf. Mart. 8.55.14, *marmorea fundens nigra Falerna manu/*.

7: the whole composition of the hexameter, with anaphora of *ite*, follows a familiar Virgilian model: the first *ite* is the opening word in the hexameter, the second—in the 5th foot after a bucolic diaeresis—forms a clause with the vocative that closes the line (cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 1.74, *ite meae, felix quondam pecus, ite capellae/*; 7.44, *ite domum pasti, si quis pudor, ite iuvenci/*; 10.77, *ite domum saturae, venit Hesperus, ite capellae/*; cf. also Calp. Sic. 2.55, *ite procul, sacer est locus, ite profani*). The punctuation of the line presents problems. Most editors take *labores* as the subject and *durum curae genus* as being in apposition, although some also punctuate *ite procul durum, curae, genus; ite labores* (eg De Golbéry, Baehrens, Lee). In addition, the expression *durum genus* already appears as part of a repudiation formula in the first prologue to the *Aetia* of Callimachus; cf. Call. *Fr.* 1.17 Pf., ἔλλετε Βασκανίης ὀλοὸν γένος.

Note too the similarity with Mart. 11.6.6, *pallentes procul hinc abite curae* (also in the context of a symposium).

ite procul: liturgical formula—and *este procul*—characteristic of the πρόρρησις, or act of expelling all those who might pollute the ritual because they have no right (being impure or profane) to witness the religious ceremony; in the Augustan poets its use becomes generalised as a formula of repudiation, rejection or prohibition, beyond the purely

religious sphere; cf. Call. *Ap.* 2, ἑκὰς ἑκὰς ὅστις ἀγιτρός (with Williams 17); Verg. *Aen.* 6.258–259, *'procul, o procul este, profani', / conclamant vates*; Prop. 4.6.9, *ite procul fraudes, alio sint aere noxae*; Ov. *Met.* 2.464, *i procul hinc ... nec sacros pollue fontes!* (with Bömer 355); 7.255, (*Medea*) *hinc procul Aesoniden, procul hinc iubet ire ministros, / et monet arcanis oculos removere profanos* (with Bömer 269); 9.509, *obscenae procul hinc discedite flammae*; 13.465–467, *vos ... / ite procul ... tactuque viriles / virgineo removete manus!*; *Fasti* 2.623–625, *procul hinc, procul impius esto / frater et in partus mater acerba suos, / cui pater vivax, qui matris digerit annos*; 4.365; Calp. Sic. 2.55 (with appar. by D. Korzeniewski, Darmstadt 1971); Juv. 2.89; 14.44 (with Courtney 566–567); Stat. *Silv.* 3.3.13, *procul hinc, procul ite nocentes* (with Laguna 261); *CLE* 443, *ito viator, ito procul*; Appel, *De Roman. precationibus* 83. The formula seems to belong specifically to the Eleusinian Mysteries, though not exclusively so, since it is found in other cults (cf. K. Clinton, *The sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries*, *TAPhS* 64,3 [Philadelphia 1974] 78). For the expression /*ite procul* at the beginning of the hexameter and the poetic reworking of this religious formula with a figurative and profane significance in the Augustan poets, see the commentary on Lygd. 4.3. The use of the formula here is half-way between the liturgical use (context of the cletic hymn) and the profane use (ritual repudiation of *curae* in the festive setting of symposia; cf. Mart. 11.6.6).

durum ... genus: for the phrase, cf. Verg. *Ge.* 1.63, *unde homines nati, durum genus.*

curae: "suffering, the cares of love"; for the different senses of the term *cura* in the 'sermo amatorius', cf. Lygd. 1.19 *sit nostri mutua cura* (comm.).

labores: πόνοι, *dolores animi*; cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.7.17–19, *tu sapiens finire memento / tristitiam vitaeque* **labores** */ molli, Plance, mero* (in a similar context of exhortation to drink to relieve one's worries); for the term denoting the *labores amoris*, cf. Pichon, p. 180; Lygd. 4.65 (comm.).

8: "may the Sun shine here (now) with white birds!" Having repudiated the ill omens (= sadness), Lygdamus invokes the favourable ones (= happiness). The deictic particle *hic* is typical of invocations. The line presents a number of difficulties regarding text and interpretation. The reading *pulserit* of the best mss. is a meaningless 'unicum', and accordingly the emendation *fulserit* which already appears in the *recentiores* is taken to be the correct one. *Delius* can only be kept along with *fulserit* and *niveis ... alitibus*, if it is understood (with Tränkle 155–160) that here it is not referring to the god Apollo

as a person, but, as a learned variant for *Phoebus* (cf. Lygd. 4.21 [comm.]), to the sun (or the day). This is possible, inasmuch as the absolutely equivalent adjective *Cynthius* is similarly used—at least in Ov. *Fasti* 3.346 and 353 (cf. Fontenrose 437)—in nominalised form as a synonym for the sun, and in addition the metonymic use of "sun" for "day" is fairly common in poetry. Lee introduces into the text the conjecture *Euhius* suggested by Baehrens ("here Bacchus shines with good omens"). Commentators have seen in *niveis . . . alitibus* an allusion to Apollo's chariot being drawn by swans. However, this idea—as is rightly observed by Tränkle 156 n. 31—is limited in Greek literature to early lyric (Alc. fr. 307.1c L.-P.; Sappho fr. 208 L.-P.), while in Roman literature and art it has left no trace at all (in contrast, the swan-drawn chariot of Venus is frequent; cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.28.15; 4.1.10; Sil. 7.441; Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.142; cf. also Prop. 3.3.39 and Ov. *Ars* 3.809). At most, the swans here could be seen as birds of the Muses consecrated to Apollo Citharoedus from the occasion on which they sang of his birth (cf. Call. *Del.* 249–255). Evidence for the swan as a poetic bird is the metamorphosis of Horace into one such bird in *Od.* 2.20.10, **albus** *mutor in* **alitem**. However, the fact that Apollo is undoubtedly being alluded to here as sun-god rules out this interpretation. Another possibility is that the reference here is to the winged white horses of the chariot of the Sun (*equi volucres, alipedes, alati*; cf. E. *El.* 464–465; *Or.* 1001; Enn. *Var.* 11; Ov. *Met.* 2.48 [with Bömer 254]; 153–154; 234; *Fasti* 3.415–416; for *niveis*, cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.1.24, *et revocant niveos Solis euntis equos*; white in Ov. *Am.* 2.2.24), but their description simply as *alites* would be a *hapax*, and the complete expression within the present context a mere filler. The only plausible interpretation for *niveis . . . alitibus* is that the intended reference is to favourable omens. Although it is true that *ales* and *avis* in this metonymic sense are usually associated with other adjectives (*bonus, secundus, aequus*; *i.a.*), observe Ov. *Am.* 3.12.1–2, a passage which is strikingly similar in formulation and context: *quis fuit ille dies, quo tristia semper amanti / omina* **non albae** *concinuistis* **aves**?. Ovid describes the day when his fortune with Corinna took a turn for the worse as a day on which black birds sang gloomy omens. Lygdamus, on the other hand, wants the banquet to take place on a sunny day when white birds will sing favourable omens, that is, he wants it to be the first day of his final farewell to Neaera, when he will be released from the suffering of love. For the commonplace of the bright day or the radiant sun as a symbol of happiness, cf. Catul. 8.3

and 8, *fulsere quondam* (*vere*, l. 8) *candidi tibi soles*; Tib. 1.3.93–94, *hoc precor, hunc illum nobis Aurora nitentem / Luciferum roseis candida portet equis*; Ov. *Am.* 2.11.55–56, *haec mihi quam primum caelo nitidissimus alto / Lucifer admisso tempora portet equo*; *Tr.* 3.5.55–56, *hos utinam nitidi Solis praenuntius ortus / afferat admisso Lucifer albus equo*; [Albinov.] *Liv.* 281–282; see also the commentary on Lygd. 3.25 *niveam . . . lucem*. For the contrary topos, namely the black day, cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.9.72–73, *huncine solem / tam nigrum surrexe mihi!* Related to this sense of the pentameter is l. 32, *venit post nimbos una serena dies*.

Delius: for this *cognomen* of Apollo, cf. Lygd. 4.79 (comm.).

9–12: Lygdamus asks his friends to follow him in his intention to get drunk. If anyone should refuse, he wishes him the same misfortune as he has suffered: that his beloved should be unfaithful to him.

9 vos modo . . . faveatis: for the construction of emphatic pronoun (*vos*) + *modo* + subjunctive (or imperative) in orders or requests, in addition to Verg. *Aen.* 7.263, *ipse modo Aeneas . . . adveniat*, see the commentary on Lygd. 4.64.

modo: for the scansion, cf. Lygd. 4.64 (comm.).

proposito . . . faveatis: for the expression, cf. Ov. *Fasti* 1.468; Sen. *Dial.* 2.9.4; Plin. *Pan.* 95.3, *vos modo favete huic proposito et credite*; Fletcher 50.

proposito: apart from Ovid, the poetic use of *propositum* is infrequent: Lucr. 1 (6.653); Hor. 4 (*Od.* 3.3.1; *Ep.* 1.13.11; *Poet.* 195; *Sat.* 2.7.7); Verg. 0; Tib. 0; [Tib.] 0; Prop. 0; Ov. (*Am.* 3.7.14; *Her.* 21[20].116; *Ars* 1.470; *Rem.* 53; 786; *Met.* 2.104; 7.276; 10.405; *Fasti* 1.468; 3.544; *Tr.* 3.4.32; *Ponto* 3.9.52).

dulces . . . amici: "charming, close friends". The same phrase is in Cic. *Am.* 90, *melius de quibusdam acerbos inimicos mereri, quam eos amicos, qui dulces videantur*; Hor. *Sat.* 1.3.139, *mihi* **dulces** *ignoscent, si quid peccaro stultus,* **amici**; Ov. *Ponto* 1.8.31, *animo dulces amici*; Aug. *Conf.* 8.6.13; *ThLL* 5.1.2194.37–39; *dulcis amicus* in Hor. *Ep.* 1.7.12, *dulcis amice*; *Ponto* 1.8.31; Pers. 5.23; Mart. 10.13.5–6, (*amicus*) *quo non est alter . . . / dulcior*; Auson. 394.2 Peiper; Hier. *Ep.* 3.4.3; *CLE* 1398.2; *ThLL* 5.1.2195.26–27; cf. also *dulcis amiculi* (gen.) in Catul. 30.2. The usual term with which to address one's symposium companions is *sodales*, in imitation of the ὦ φιλοί, πίνετε of archaic Greek (cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.27.7; 37.4, with Nisbet-Hubbard 313 and 412); cf., however, Hor. *Epod.* 13.3–4, *rapiamus, amici, / occasionem de die*. A clear idea of the considerable emotional implications of the adjective *dulcis*, as well as its familiar tone, can be got from its extensive use in epitaphs; cf.

Colafrancesco-Massaro, *Concordanze dei CLE*, pp. 185–188 s.v. *dulcis* and sim.; *ThLL* 5.1.2188.16.

10: for the formulation of this line, cf. Val.-Flac. 3.694–695, *an sese comitem tam tristibus actis / abneget?*; with simple accusative object, cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.35.22, *te Spes et . . . rara Fides colit . . . nec comitem abnegat*; Ov. *Ars* 1.127, *si qua repugnarat nimium comitemque negabat.* Note the studied combination *me duce se comitem* at the end of the line to highlight the *dux-comes* hierarchical structure.

neve . . . quisquam: ie *et nemo* (or *nullus*). There has been a transposition of the negative idea. When the copulative conjunction *et* is followed by a negative pronoun or adverb, the negation generally falls on the particle (*et nemo* > *nec quisquam*); cf. Hofmann-Szantyr 455 (§ 241 F); Bassols II.55 (§ 53) and 96 (§ 93). The poetic use of *neve* to introduce a prohibition after a positive command goes back to Verg. *Ge.* 2.37, *fructus . . . feros mollite colendo, neu segnes iaceant terrae* (cf. also *Aen.* 7.265; Hor. *Od.* 1.2.51; Ov. *Tr.* 1.5.37, *date naufragio litora tuta meo; neve metu falso nimium trepidate*; Val.-Flac. 6.539).

me duce: at symposia, the drinking was supervised by the *rex convivii* or *magister* (or *arbiter*) *bibendi*, a kind of master of ceremonies (Gr. συμποσίαρχος). His role was to indicate the type and quality of the wines to be drunk, the number of cups to be served, the proportion of water to wine in each libation, the toasts, etc. (cf. Cic. *Verr.* 5.28). The wine was mixed with water, in equal parts to start off with; then the proportion of neat wine gradually increased, progressively older and stronger as the end of the party drew near. On this figure of Greek origin, cf. Pl. *Lg.* 1.637b–642b. The *rex convivii* had to be chosen (cf. Xen. *An.* 6.1.30) or appointed (cf. Pl. *St.* 702), or sometimes—a motive for scandal—one of the guests would appoint himself (cf. Pl. *Smp.* 213 e). The question of who should preside over the celebration could also be decided by throwing dice; cf. Plu. *Cat. Mi.* 6.1; Hor. *Od.* 1.4.18, *nec regna vini sortiere talis* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 71); 2.7.25–26, *quem Venus arbitrum / dicet bibendi?* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 121), where *Venus* is equivalent to *iactus Veneris* or *Venerius* (Gr. Ἀφροδίτη καλή), the most favourable throw of the dice, that is, when the four dice showed a different number, according to Lucian. *Am.* 16 (cf. Pl. *As.* 905; Cic. *Div.* 1.23 [with Pease 122]; 2.48; 121; Prop. 4.8.45; Suet. *Aug.* 71; Mart. 14.14; D. M. Robinson, "The Wheel of Fortune", *CPh* 41 [1946] 209; *RE* 9.555). Plutarch in *Quaest. Conv.* 620 provides an interesting list of duties of the συμποσίαρχος; cf. also Lucian. *Sat.* 4. Curiously, in all the rest of the output of the elegiac

genre there is only one other direct reference to the figure of the *arbiter bibendi*; cf. Ov. *Ars* 1.581–582, *huic, si sorte bibes, sortem concedere priorem, / huic detur capiti missa corona tuo.*

For the expression *me duce* in poetry, cf. eg Verg. *Ecl.* 4.13, *te duce*; *Aen.* 10.92, *me duce*; Ov. *Am.* 2.12.13; *Met.* 3.12, *hac duce*; 8.208, *me duce carpe viam*; 14.112; *Fasti* 4.715, *te duce*; 6.458, *hoc duce.* For the juxtapostion *dux-comes*, cf. Cic. *Flac.* 5; *Har.* 58; *Marc.* 11; *Am.* 37; 96; *Att.* 11.12.2; *Ep.* 6.6.12; 10.3.4; Catul. 63.15; Ov. *Her.* 14.106; *Tr.* 3.7.18.

comitem: here *latiore sensu* as 'rei alicuius participem'; cf. *OLD comes* 5; *ThLL* 3.1774.28 ff.

11 vini certamen mite: a wine-drinking contest (*certamen bibendi*, Plin. *Nat.* 36.156; cf. Cic. *Flac.* 92). This *certamen bibendi* could consist, for instance, in quaffing a great quantity of wine without breathing (Plin. *Nat.* 14.139; Ambr. *Hel.* 13, "breathing is against the rules"). The "mad laws" of the *rex* always had to be obeyed (cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.2.123; 2.6.69). Observe the striking oxymoron *certamen mite* (as opposed to *Martis certamen immite*), reminiscent of the Propertian *servitium mite* (Prop. 2.20.20); on the battles of Bacchus, cf. Mart. 4.82.6, *sed sua cum medius proelia Bacchus amat.* The adjective *mitis* may be suggested by the wine (cf. Verg. *Ge.* 1.344, *lacte favos et miti dilue Baccho*; cf. also Catul. 62.50, *mitem . . . uvam*; Hor. *Od.* 1.7.19, *molli . . . mero*), or else because drinking is in itself a pleasure, Bacchus being a god who is the friend of men in that he relieves the pain brought on by love. For the opposite viewpoint, cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.18.7, *ac ne quis modici transiliat munera Liberi*; 27.4, where Horace rejects the *proelia Bacchi* as a foreign practice (*verecundus Bacchus*, l. 3). For another unfavourable opinion, cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.1.17, *nequitiam vinosa tuam convivia narrant.*

recusat: for the poetic use of this verb, cf. Lygd. 4.73 (comm.).

12: an imprecation. There is a strikingly similar formulation in Sil. 3.233–234, (*Tyria pubes*) *docilis fallendi et nectere tectos nunquam tarda dolos*; in fact, the phrase *tectus dolus* is only found in these two passages; cf. also Tib. 1.9.24, *occultos . . . dolos* (in the context of infidelity); Ov. *Am.* 1.2.6, *an subit et* **tecta** *callidus* **arte** *nocet?*. The content of the curse, however, is similar to *Priap.* 47:

> *Quicumque vestrum, qui venitis ad coenam*
> *libare nullos sustinet mihi versus:*
> *illius uxor, aut amica, rivalem*
> *lasciviendo languidum precor reddat.*
> *At ipse longa nocte dormiat solus,*
> *libidinosis incitatus erucis.*

Note also Tib. 1.9.53–54, *at te, qui puerum donis corrumpere es ausus / rideat adsiduis uxor inulta dolis.*

fallat . . . dolo: for the expression, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.683–684, *tu faciem illius . . . / falle dolo*; Fletcher 50.

eum: in the elegists, *eum* only appears elsewhere in Prop. 2.29.8; 3.20.1; Ov. *Fasti* 4.551; 6.584; 6.755; never in Tibullus. On the Latin poets' aversion towards the prosaic demonstrative pronoun *is*, particularly in the oblique cases, see Lygd. 4.94 *is* (comm.).

tecto . . . dolo: for the elegiac motif of *furtivus amor*, cf. Pichon, p. 158 s.v. *furta*; Kost 123 *ad* Musae. 1, κρυφίων . . . ἐρώτων; McKeown 101 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.4.64 *furtim*. For the elegiac sense of *dolum*, cf. Tib. 1.9.24; 54 (*sup. cit.*); Prop. 3.23.18; 4.7.16; Ov. *Am.* 2.19.44; Pichon, p. 133 ('*doli* vocantur saepius artes quibus amantes virorum aut custodum diligentiam fallunt').

fallat: on the elegiac nuances of *fallere*, see the commentary on Lygd. 1.6; 4.62; 46; Pichon, pp. 141–142.

cara puella: the same phrase in Lygd. 2.1.

13–17a maiora valet: contrasting aretalogies of Amor and Bacchus. The god of wine raises the spirit (l. 13a), while the god of love pulls down the haughty and humiliates them in the degrading service of a mistress (l. 13b–14). Bacchus tamed wild beasts (ll. 16–17). Amor is capable of similar or even greater feats (l. 18a). A correct understanding of these lines has always been hampered, in my view, by a short-sighted interpretation of the anaphoric *ille* (*deus*) . . . *ille* . . . *ille*. Traditionally, commentators have opted for one of the following two possibilities: a) all the pronouns (*ille*) anaphorically reinforce the reference to the same person; b) they refer to different persons (= *alter . . . alter*, "one . . ., the other"), that is, to Bacchus and Amor. Of those who follow the first interpretation, some maintain that these lines, in view of *dites* (l. 13), can only refer to Bacchus, as it is he who makes the human spirit "rich" (cf. Hor. *Ep.* 1.15.18 ff.); for others, in contrast, the god who "brings down the haughty and submits him to the whims of a mistress" can only be Amor, and they solve the difficulty of *dites* by emending it to *mites*. However, the assumption of a corruption of *mites* into *dites*, given the previous *mite* (l. 11) and following *mollia* (l. 16), should logically be viewed warily. For my part, I prefer the second possibility (*ille . . . ille* used to denote an alternative), since l. 13a ties in better with Bacchus and ll. 13b–14 with Amor. But it must not be forgotten that there is a third *ille*. There is really a second shift, with the second *ille* being replaced

by Amor. This gives the following scheme: *ille* (scil. *Bacchus*) . . . *ille* (scil. *Amor*) . . . *ille* (scil. *Bacchus*) . . . *Amor*. In the first alternation the opposing power of the two gods over the spirits of men is contrasted: Bacchus (wine) raises spirits that have been lowered; Amor, on the other hand, brings down the haughty. The image of Bacchus as a humanitarian god is thus reinforced. Amor, in contrast, is seen as a cruel-hearted deity. It should be borne in mind that Lygdamus is looking for help from Bacchus against none other than Amor. In the second alternation, Bacchus appears as a tamer of wild beasts. Here the poet drops the image of Bacchus as wine-god and alludes to his feats as a mythological human-god. Dionysus/Bacchus tamed and killed wild animals when just a child (cf. Nonn. *D.* 9.169–179) and the tamer of lions is perhaps a continuation of the figure of an Anatolian lord of the animals. The figurative arts like to depict him surrounded by felines, in a chariot drawn by wild animals or riding on a lion, tiger or panther (see the figurative complex of the so-called "Indian triumph"; R. Turcan, *Les sarcophages romains à représentations dionysiaques*, Paris 1966; further references to representations in literature and the plastic arts in Austin 247–248 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 6.805). Tamed beasts symbolize the civilizing power of Bacchus; cf. Bömer 610–611 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 3.668. This last testimony to the power of Bacchus is contrasted by a laconic but expressive *haec Amor et maiora valet*. The power of this god to soothe wild beasts is well known (eg [Verg.] *Cir.* 135–136, *ille iram Poenos domitare leones / et validas docuit vires mansuescere tigres* (with Lyne 157); Ov. *Fasti* 4.103, *deposita sequitur taurus feritate iuvencam*; cf. also Ov. *Ars* 2.183, [*obsequium amoris*] *tigresque domat Numidasque leones*). The *maiora* leaves the doors of the imagination open to even greater prowess: perhaps the power of Amor over the immortals themselves?; in this respect, cf. the line which follows those cited above in the epyllion *Ciris*: *ille etiam divos omnes -sed dicere magnum est* (l. 137). Nor should we forget the Virgilian maxim *omnia vincit Amor* (Verg. *Ecl.* 10.69); cf. also Ov. *Met.* 7.55, *maximus intra me* (= *Medeam*) *deus* (= *Amor*) *est*.

13–15 ille . . . ille . . . ille: the anaphoric use of *ille* is an important technique in the language of hymn-prayers, the 'Er-Stil', when expressing the δύναμις θεοῦ. The same procedure was used by Virgil in the first bucolic, in lines in which he presents Octavian as a *deus* (ll. 6–10), and in the hymns to Venus of Tib. 1.2.15–22 and Prop. 1.14.17–21 (with Fedeli 329–330). Virgil and the elegists are simply imitating a procedure from the sacred language of Greek, consisting

of the anaphora of οὗτος; cf. Democr. *Fr.* 30 (= H. Diels-W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* II [Berlin 1952^6] 151); Aristid. 1.8 Dindorf; Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, pp. 163 ff.; McKeown 127–128 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.6.7–8.

13 ille facit dites animos deus: "that god (= Bacchus) enriches the spirit", that is, "gives encouragement". This may be an echo of Hor. *Ep.* 1.15.19, (*vinum*) **generosum** *et lene requiro, / quod curas abigat, quod cum spe* **divite** *manet / in venas animumque meum*, a text which presents other notable parallelisms. As regards the formulation, note the similarity with Ov. *Ars* 1. 237 ff.:

> ***Vina*** *parant* ***animos faciunt****que caloribus aptos:*
> *cura fugit multo diluitur mero.*
> *Tunc veniunt risus,* ***tum pauper cornua sumit****, . . .*

From here Lygdamus might have taken not only the construction *facere animos* + predicative accusative, but also the idea that the poor man, when he gets drunk, becomes rich (*cornua sumit*). *Dites* would simply be the reverse of *pauper* (cf. also Hor. *Od.* 1.18.5, *quis post vina gravem militiam aut* **pauperiem** *crepat?*). Ovid in turn had taken the formulation *pauper cornua sumit* from Hor. *Od.* 3.21.18, *tu* (scil. *amphora vini*) *viresque et addis cornua pauperi* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 231, who for this *communis locus* on wine cite Thgn. 1129, ἐμπίομαι πενίης θυμοφθόρου οὐ μελεδαίνων; Pi. *Fr.* 124 B. 8, ὅς μὲν ἀχρήμων, ἀφνεὸς τότε; B. *Fr.* 20 B. 13, χρυσῷ δ' ἐλέφαντί τε μαρμαίρουσιν οἶκοι, what a man thinks when drunk; Carm. Pop. *PMG* 879, Σεμλήι' Ἴακχε πλουτοῦσι; *AP* 11.63.2 [Maced.], ἐλπίσιν ἡμερίδων ῥίψατε τὴν πενίην). For *cornua* as a symbol of strength and pride, cf. also Ov. *Am.* 3.11.6, *venerunt capiti cornua sera meo* (here again in connection with love that has been overcome); for the proverbial nature of these expressions with *cornua*, cf. Otto, *Sprichwörter*, 94. Curiously, the opposite expression to *sumere cornua* appears to be *contundere cornua*; cf. Mart. 9.101.17, *cornua Sarmatici ter perfida* **contudit** *Histri.*

dites: for the metaphorical sense of *dis* as "rich in spirit", cf. Lucr. 1.413, *meo . . . diti de pectore.*

ferocem: ie *superbum.* In elegy, *ferox* denotes the arrogant and scornful in love, the man who rebels against servile submission to love or his mistress (*servitium amoris*), in view of the similarity with wild animals, especially the wild bull that rejects the yoke of the plough (cf. Tib. 1.5.5, *ure ferum et torque*; 2.6.5, *ure, puer* (scil. *Amor*), *quaeso, tua qui ferus otia liquit*; Prop. 2.3.49; Ov. *Her.* 4.165; Pichon, p. 145).

13–14 ferocem / contudit: high-flown style; cf. Enn. *Ann.* 386 and 521 Sk. (= 395 and 448 Vahlen); Verg. *Aen.* 1.263–264, *populosque feroces / contundet*; Prop. 1.1.10 [*Milanion*] *saevitiam durae contudit Iasidos*; Ov. *Ars* 1.12, [*Chiron*] *animos placida contudit arte feros.*

14 dominae . . . in arbitrium: cf. Tib. 2.3.79, *ad imperium dominae sulcabimus agros.* For the genitive-preposition-noun anastrophe, see the commentary on Lygd. 2.9 *tenuem in umbram*; for the elegiac topos of *servitium dominae*, see Lygd. 4.66 (comm.).

dominae: for the elegiac sense of the term, cf. Lygd. 4.74 (comm.).

misit in arbitrium: prosaic formulation; cf. Sen. *Ep.* 83.22; Ulp. *Dig.* 18.1.7. pr.

15: the formulation of the line as a whole is similar to Ov. *Met.* 15.86, *Armeniae tigres iracundique leones/*, the only other passage in which these two types of animal are found in the same line.

Armenias tigres: Armenian tigresses are often mentioned in Roman poetry from Verg. *Ecl.* 5.29, *Daphnis et Armenias curru subiungere tigris / instituit*; cf. also Prop. 1.9.19, *tum magis Armenias cupies accedere tigres*; Ov. *Met.* 8.121, */Armenia tigres*; 15.86, *Armeniae tigres iracundique leones* (in both *loci Ovidiani* at the beginning of the line; in the second, also combining lions and tigers as in Lygdamus). The tiger is mentioned in connection with Dionysus only among the Romans, although undoubtedly following Greek models (Norden 325): Verg. *Ecl.* 5.29 ff. (on Daphnis, the "new" Dionysus); *Aen.* 6.805, *Liber agens celso Nysae de vertice tigris*; Hor. *Od.* 3.3.13–14, *Bacche pater, tuae vexere tigres*; Ov. *Am.* 1.2.47–48, *talis erat domita Bacchus Gangetide terra: tu gravis alitibus, tigribus ille fuit*; *Ars* 1.545–550; 559; *Met.* 3.668 (with Bömer 610–611).

fulvas . . . leaenas/: for the phrase, cf. Verg. *Ge.* 4.408, *fulva cervice leaena/*; *fulvus* is the classic epithet for lions from Lucr. 5.901, *corpora fulva leonum*; cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 2.722; 4.159; 8.552; Ov. *Her.* 10.85; *Met.* 1.304; 10.551; 698; *Fasti* 2.339. Unlike Lygd. 4.90, where the choice of the female over the male is easily explained within a topos of insensitivity related to the birth and rearing of progeny, here the choice of sex is arbitrary; cf. Richter *ad* Verg. *Ge.* 4.408 *sup. cit.*: «*leaena* statt *leo* steht dichterisch öfter, ohne es auf das Geschlecht ankommt»; this is the case in both the present *locus Lygdameus* and in Verg. *Ecl.* 2.63; Ov. *Ars* 1.762; *Met.* 8.732 (with Bömer 239–240); *Fasti* 5.371; Sil. 7.425; on the other hand, the sex is relevant in other cases, like Ov. *Met.* 13.547, *catulo lactente orbata leaena*, or Lygd. 4.90. For the alternative forms *lea/leaena*, cf. Bömer 464 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 9.648 *leae*; Lygd. 4.90 *saeva leaena* (comm.); *ThLL* 7.2.1077.31–52.

16 mollia corda dedit: for the expression, cf. Juv. 15.131–132, *mollissima corda humano generi dare se natura fatetur.* The phrase *molle cor* is Ovidian; cf. Ov. *Her.* 15 (*Ep. Sapphos*).79; *Tr.* 4.10.65–66; 5.8.28; *Ponto* 1.3.32; Juv. 15.131; Iren. 4.39.2; 941.47–48; *ThLL* 4.941.47–40; also Ovidian are the opposite phrases *cor forte* (Ov. *Tr.* 3.3.57; cf. Lygd. 2.6 [comm.]) and *durum cor* (Ov. *Her.* 4.156; Porph. *Od.* 1.3.9).

17a haec Amor et maiora valet: the traditional *volet* of all the mss. makes no sense. The reading *valet*, accepted by all editors since Broukhusius, already appears in the *apparatus criticus* of Ach. Statius.

17b(sed poscite Bacchi)–26: a further exhortation to drink, this time with the threat that the god Bacchus will unleash his wrath against those who do not imbibe in his honour.

17 sed: underlines the sudden contrast.

17–18 poscite Bacchi / munera: "ask for wine". Poetic periphrases of the type "gift(s) of Bacchus" ultimately go back to the δῶρα Διονύσου which are frequently mentioned in Greek literature from Hes. *Op.* 614 (cf. B. *Fr.* 20 B. 9, Διονυσίοισι δώροις); in Roman literature from Virgil (eg *Ge.* 2.4–5, [*Bacche*] *tuis hic omnis plena / muneris*), who is also responsible for the phrase *Bacchi munera*; cf. *Ge.* 3.526–527, *Massica Bacchi / munera*; Ov. *Ars* 1.562; *Met.* 4.765, *postquam epulis functi generosi munere Bacchi*; 12.578, *repetito munere Bacchi*; Mart. 8.68.4, *Bacchi munera*; the variant *munera Liberi* in Hor. *Od.* 1.18.7 (with Nisbet-Hubbard 232); 4.15.26, *inter iocosi munera Liberi*; *Paneg.* 6.9.2; *Lyaei munera* in Sil. 7.748; *Bacchea munera* in Stat. *Ach.* 1.184; *Baccheia munera* in *CLE* 280.1; Auson. *Mos.* 153 (for this poetic use of *munera* applied to wine as Bacchus' gift to men, cf. also Lygd. 6.4, *tuo* [scil. *Bacchi*] . . . *munere*; *ThLL* 8.1664.45–48); *Lenaea dona* in Stat. *Silv.* 4.6.80–81 (with Coleman 190). Other mythological periphrases to refer to "wine" are *latices Lenaei* in Verg. *Ge.* 3.510; *Lenaeum* . . . *honorem* in Verg. *Ge.* 4.207. For the metonym *Bacchus* (*Liber*, *Lyaeus*) = *vinum*, *merum*, as well as for the antonomasia-cum-metonym *auctor muneris* = *Bacchum* = *vinum*, and mythological metonymy in general, see Lygd. 2.19 *annoso* . . . *Lyaeo* (comm.); 6.5 *generoso* . . . *Baccho*; 57 *Naida Bacchus amat.*

poscite: *poscere* ("to request, demand insistently") carries greater emphasis than *petere* or *rogare*; cf. Petr. *Satyr.* 27.6, *aquam poposcit ad manus.*

18 vestrum: partitive genitive governed by *quem.*

pocula sicca: ie *pocula vacua.* Opposite expression to l. 5, *madeant* . . . *pocula. Madidi* and *sicci* are metaphorical terms to refer to the inebriated

and the sober respectively; cf. Hor. *Od.* 4.5.39, *sicci . . . uvidi*; Cels. 1.3.14, *tenuis . . . homo implere se debet . . . madens siccare, siccus madefacere.*
19–21: Bacchus proves himself friendly towards his devotees.
19: the traditional *in illis* closing the line can be kept, since the adjective *aequus*, to which the adverbial expression *ex aequo* is equivalent, is constructed in poetry with *in* + ablative (eg Prop. 3.17.28, *victor erat quamvis, aequus in hoste fuit*); for *in illis* = *erga illos*, cf. also Ov. *Her.* 21.12, *talis in Hippolyto vix fuit illa suo.* Nevertheless, Luck's emendation *in illos*—already found in some early editions—is attractive, given the idea of movement contained in *convenit.*

ex aequo: ie *aequus* ("on an equal footing" > "propitious", "benevolent"). The mainly poetic use of this adverbial expression (= ἐξ ἴσου) is attested from Afran. 289–290, *quanto facilius ego, qui ex aequo venio, adducor ferre humana humanitus*; never in Virgil or Horace; in Ovid (*Met.-Fasti* 3: elsewhere 5), it preserves its distributive sense "in equal parts"; cf. eg *Am.* 1.10.33, *quae Venus ex aequo ventura est grata duobus* (with McKeown 296); *Ars* 2.682, *quod iuvet, ex aequo femina virque ferant*; 3.794, *ex aequo res iuvet illa* [= sexual intercourse] *duos*; *Her.* 16(*Paris Helenae*).87; 20(*Acontyus Cydippae*).125; *Met.* 3.145, *sol ex aequo meta distabat utraque* (with Bömer 489); 4.62; 5.565, *Iuppiter ex aequo voluentem dividit annum*; cf. also Sen. *Ep.* 66.6, *aves ex aequo partiuntur cibos.* The closest example to Lygdamus in poetry is Luc. *Civ.* 8.232, *solus . . . e numero regum telluris Eoae ex aequo me Parthus adit.*

nec torvus: litotes. The literary use of *torvus* ("fierce", "heartless") is an old one and practically limited to elevated poetry. The earliest attested occurrences are from the corpus of the archaic tragedians (cf. Pacuv. *Trag.* 36; 37, *feroci ingenio, torvus*; Acc. *Trag.* 223). Applied to people, in addition to Pacuv. *Trag.* 37, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 10.170, *torvus Abas*; Hor. *Od.* 1.28.17, *torvo . . . Marti*; 3.5.44 (of Regulus); Prop. 3.18.24 (of Charon); Ov. *Her.* 2.69; 16.16; Stat. *Theb.* 1.712; *Silv.* 2.1.143; Juv. 4.147). Among prose-writers, the historian Tacitus strikingly only uses this adjective in the *Annales* (cf. *Ann.* 4.60; 16.29). For the elegiac use (= *severus, iratus*), cf. Pichon, p. 282.

nec: on the postponing of *nec* in Augustan poetry, cf. Norden *Aen.*, Anh. III, p. 404, who cites for *nec* 'tertio loco', apart from the present passage of Lygdamus, Verg. *Aen.* 2.159; Tib. 1.8.4; Prop. 3.10.10; 22.28; 4.8.56. For Propertius, see statistics by M. Rothstein, *Hermes* 23 (1888) 517 n. 2: in Propertius *nec* appears 6 times after the 1st word in the phrase, 3 times after the 2nd, and twice after the third; cf. also Fedeli 241 *ad* Prop. 1.9.17 and 11.16. For the elegists as a

whole, cf. Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, pp. 94–95; in Lygdamus, cf. 4.91 (comm.) and 6.55, *nec* in both cases coming second in the phrase; for the general tendency of Latin poetry to postpone particles for purely metrical reasons after the *neoterici* and in imitation of the Alexandrians, see the commentary on Lygd. 1.19 *sed*.

Liber: on this *cognomen* of Bacchus, see the commentary on l. 1.

20: for the pleonastic repetition of *qui* (*qui . . . quique una*), cf. Lygd. 2.3–4 *qui . . . / . . . qui potuit* (comm.); 3.36, (*Parcae*) *stamina* ***quae*** *ducunt* ***quaeque*** *futura canunt*. Note the zeugma in *colunt*, "to worship" a god (Bacchus) and "to devote oneself" to an activity (drinking). For this latter sense, cf. Prop. 2.26.26, *carmina tam sancte nulla puella colit*; Liv. 1.16.7, *rem militarem colant*.

vina iocosa: for the phrase, cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.21.15–16, *iocoso . . . Lyaeo*. Fletcher (p. 50) cites 4.15.26, *iocosi . . . Liberi* (though here the reference is to the god himself); cf. also Hor. *Od.* 3.21.2, (*amphora*) *geris iocos*.

vina: this plural form is normal in poetry for the nominative and accusative: Virgil, for instance, never uses the singular (cf. Austin 136 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 4.455). On the other hand, for the genitive and ablative *vini* and *vino* are the regular forms (cf. Lygd. 6.11 *vini*). Löfstedt (*Synt.* I, p. 48) sees in this poetic use of *vina* a vague echo of neuter plurals in *-a* as old collective feminine nouns; P. Maas (*ALL* 12, p. 521) points to the metrical advantages of *vina* over the less versatile *vinum*.

21: Bacchus shows himself to be wrathful and proud with those who slight him, that is, the sober (cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.18.3, *siccis omnia nam dura deus* [scil. *Bacchus*] *proposuit*). This line has come down to us in a disfigured state (*non venit iratus nimium nimiumque severus*). However, the conviction that the allusion here is to the opposite group to the one described in the previous distich (the devotees of Bacchus or the inebriated) helps in emending the text. Consequently, *non venit* is not suitable, as it would cancel out *iratus*. In its place the conjecture *convenit* (Lachmann) seems acceptable, as it restores the parallelism with l. 19. The group of those who show contempt for Bacchus, or the abstemious, must be alluded to in the last word of the line, conveniently emended into *severis* by Livineius (the term *severi* is also applied to the sober or abstemious in Catul. 27.5–7, *at vos quo lubet hinc abite, lymphae, / vini pernicies, et ad severos / migrate*, and Hor. *Ep.* 1.19.9). If the transmitted form *severus* is kept, the line is made redundant by l. 19 and the *his* of l. 23 would lack a referent; Lachmann's proposal

severos, though it is still accepted by editors today, (Dissen, Müller, Baehrens, Némethy, Pichard, Tescari, Lenz-Galinsky, Lee) does not seem very convincing, since *convenire aliquem* is a strange expression to refer to the tribulations inflicted on mortals by a god: *convenire* in its transitive use rather expresses harmony and agreement between the person-subject and person-object. In addition, just as *iratus* is the reverse of *nec torvus*, *nimiusque* (the correct reading, in my view, as transmitted by certain isolated mss., as opposed to the traditional *nimiumque*) is the reverse of *ex aequo*. The adjective *nimius* contains an idea of excess which, applied to people, expresses the transgression of the limits of proper behaviour. Contrasted with *ex aequo*, "measured, moderate", *nimius* takes on the meaning of "excessive, immoderate", a sense redolent of violence given the proximity of *iratus*. This use of *nimius*, applied to personal behaviour or character, is predominantly post-classical (cf. Sen. *Ag.* 84, *Erinys, nimias* [i.e. *nimiorum*] *semper comitata domos*; Stat. *Silv.* 5.5.57; *Ach.* 1.570; Plin. *Ep.* 5.8.13; Sil. 16.342; Apul. *Met.* 8.7; *i.a.*). There is a classical precedent in Hor. *Od.* 2.12.5, *Lapithas et nimium mero Hylaeum*. In connection with the idea of violence, cf. Tac. *Hist.* 4.23, *praeferoces initio rebus secundis nimii*. The corruption of *nimius* by contamination with the preceding *nimium* brought in its wake the corruption of *severis* into *severus* through *-que*. The adverb *nimium* does not affect the meaning of *iratus* or *severis*, but of *nimius*. The enclitic particle *-que* affects the whole syntagma *nimium nimius*, the unity of sense of which is reinforced and guaranteed by the paronomasia. For the paronomasia *nimium nimiusque*, cf. Apul. *Met.* 8.7, *Thrasyllus nimium nimius clamare, plangere*; for the traditional reading *nimium nimiumque*, cf. Ov. *Her.* 1.41, *nimium nimiumque oblite tuorum*; Mart. 8.3.17, *scribunt ista graves nimium nimiumque severi* (cf. Axelson, "Lygd. & Ov.", p. 292); for the reduplication, cf. also Verg. *Aen.* 11.841, *heu nimium, virgo, nimium crudele*...; [Verg.] *Cir.* 161, *heu nimium certo, nimium* (with Lyne 166).

convenit: the verb *convenire* ("to come, arrive") is the proper one to refer to the epiphany of the god invoked; there is no need to make it equivalent to *esse*, as Tränkle 160 would have it. There is a similar use of the simple verb *venire* (cf. Fedeli 262 *ad* Prop. 1.10.25). For an analogous use of the Gr. ἔρχομαι, cf. R. C. Jebb, *Sophocles. Oedipus Tyrannus* (Cambridge 1914) 177.

22: advice from Lygdamus exhorting his friends to drink, a logical consequence of the previous lines.

irati: scil. *dei* (= *Bacchi*). On *iratus* as a substantive, see Tib.

2.1.74, *limen ad iratae verba pudenda senem* (with Murgatroyd 60); *ThLL* 7.2.374.57 ff.

numina magna: for the phrase, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.623; 3.264; Ov. *Am.* 2.8.18 (in the same place in the pentameter). On *magnus* as a solemn epithet to refer to the strength and power of the gods, see the commentary on Lygd. 4.16 *magnos . . . deos.* On *numina,* see the commentary on Lygd. 4.53.

23–26: mythological *exemplum* (paradigmatic function) illustrating the cruelty with which Bacchus punishes his enemies. The formulation of the distich is excessively bombastic and irregular. The accumulation of interrogative particles in the hexameter is prosaic. In contrast, the poetic periphrasis *Cadmeae matris praeda cruenta* alluding to the punishment of Pentheus is extremely learned and highflown.

23: as regards the formulation, note the concurrence of a number of interrogative pronouns with different functions, though referring to the same verb, within the same interrogative clause (*quales . . . qualis quantusque*). This is a peculiarity of Latin (and Greek), the construction being especially frequent in Livy and Cicero; cf. Cic. *Com.* 21, *considera . . ., quis quem fraudasse dicatur*; *Verr.* 2.3.191, *quo ex loco in quem locum ne portarent?*; 152, *quae quibus propositis essent . . . consequentia* (with n. by Kroll); 297, *hi benim fuerunt certe oratores; quanti autem et quales, tu videris*; *Mil.* 23, *uter utri insidias fecerit*; *De or.* 3.85, *vis enim et natura rei, nisi perfecta ante oculos ponitur, qualis et quanta sit intellegi non potest*; *Tusc.* 3.56; Liv. 2.21.4, *qui consules secundum quosnam* (*fuerint*). On this syntactical peculiarity of Latin, cf. Hofmann-Szantyr 459–450 (§ 244 d *Zus.* α); Bassols II.43–44 (§ 38). As for the emphatic combination *qualis quantusque,* it is a construction that is common to the best poets; cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.2.1, *quae virtus et quanta*; 70, *victus tenuis quae quantaque secum adferat*; Verg. *Aen.* 2.591–592, (scil. *Venus*) *confessa deam qualis videri caelicolis et quanta solet*; 3.641, *nam qualis quantusque cavo Polyphemus in antro . . . claudit pecudes . . . centum alii . . . haec habitant ad litora . . . Cyclopes*; Prop. 2.8.11, *munera quanta dedi vel qualia carmina feci!* (each word here referring to different nouns); Val.-Flac. 4.603–604; among the elegists only in Ov. *Met.* 3.284–286, *quantusque et qualis* (scil. *Iuppiter*) *ab alta / Iunone excipitur, tantus talisque, rogato* (scil. *Semeles*), */ det tibi complexus . . .!*. However, these other instances from poetry which can be cited as parallels for *qualis quantusque* come from either exclamatory or relative clauses, but not from interrogative clauses as is the case with Lygdamus here; cf. Axelson, "Lygd. & Ov.", p. 105; Büchner, "Lygdamus", pp. 505–506; Tränkle 161.

his: scil. *severis.*

minetur: the formula *minari aliquod alicui* ("to threaten someone with something") is quite an old one (cf. Pl. *Per.* 361, *eru' si minatus est malum servo meo*; Ter. *Eun.* 1020; Cic. *Phil.* 3.18, *supplicium minatur optimis civibus*; *i.a.*); in elevated poetry from Verg. *Aen.* 10.900, *quid increpas mortemque minaris*, and Hor. *Od.* 1.28.25, *quodcumque minabitur Eurus fluctibus Hesperiis* (cf. also Ov. *Ponto* 2.2.23, *licet... vulnera saeva mineris* [scil. *mihi*]).

24 Cadmeae matris praeda cruenta: allusion to the misfortune suffered by one of Bacchus' enemies, Pentheus, who was torn to pieces by his mother Agave and her Theban companions in a state of extasy. According to the legend, Dionysus, having conquered Asia, returned to Thebes, his native land, to establish his cult there. The king, Pentheus, tried to oppose the propagation of this violent cult, treated Dionysus as a charlatan and impostor, denied his divinity and finally made bold to chain him. The god broke out of his bonds and inflicted the punishment of madness on Agave, mother of Pentheus and daughter of Cadmus (*Cadmeae matris*), and all the Theban women, who, transformed into Bacchantes, climbed Mt. Cithaeron to hold the Dionysiac orgies there. Pentheus, warned by the god in the guise of a stranger, unwisely followed them and hid in a pine-tree with the intention of spying on them; but the women discovered him, uprooted the tree and, led by his mother, who mistook him for a wild beast, tore him to pieces. To this myth, which became extremely well known as a result of Euripides' and Aeschylus' dramatic treatment of it, was attributed a religious significance. Pentheus was the prototype of the impious man (*comtemptor superum*, as he is called by Ovid in *Met.* 3.514) punished for his pride. On this mythological passage, cf. Euripides, *Bacchae*, *passim*; Ov. *Met.* 3.511–733; Nonn. *Dionys.* 44–46; cf. also Grimal, *Mitología*, pp. 420–421; Guirand, *Mitología general*, p. 225; Ruiz de Elvira, *Mitología clásica*, pp. 179–180, 182; *OCD* 799.

Concerning the formulation, as noted by Axelson ("Lygd. & Ovid", p. 106), it is a contamination between Ov. *Fasti* 3.721 (also referring to Pentheus), *tu quoque Thebanae mala praeda tacebere matris*, and Ov. *Fasti* 5.178, *ipse fuit Libycae praeda cruenta leae.* Büchner ("Lygdamus", p. 506) does not rule out a now-lost common source, possibly Gallus. For *docet* at the end of the pentameter, underlining the exemplary nature of the Pentheus myth, cf. Ov. *Met.* 4.429–430, *quidque furor valeat, Penthea caede satisque / ac super ostendit.*

Cadmeae matris: for the phrase, cf. Sen. *Oed.* 1006 (here nominative); cf. also [Verg.] *Cul.* 111, *Cadmeis Agave;* Stat. *Theb.* 1.376, *genetrix Cadmeia* (scil. *Agave*).

Cadmeae: the adjective *Cadme(i)us* (Gr. Καδμήιος o Καδμεῖος) is only attested among the Augustan poets in Propertius (1.7.1; 3.13.7) and [Verg.] *Cul.* 254, while it is frequent among the post-Augustans, especially Seneca and Statius, less so in Lucan, Valerius Flaccus and Martial (cf. *ThLL Onom.* 2 C 10.37–63). Ovid only uses the variant *Cadmeis-idos* (Gr. Καδμηίς), previously found only in Acc. *Trag.* 235 and [Verg.] *Cul.* 111 (*Cadmeis Agave*), though frequent among the post-Ovidian poets (cf. *ThLL Onom.* 2 C 10.63–69).

praeda cruenta: for the expression, cf. Ov. *Fasti* 5.178, *ille fuit Libycae praeda cruenta leae.*

praeda: ie *Pentheus.* Lygdamus rightly calls him "prey", since he was "trapped" by his mother and the Theban women who in the frenzy of their Bacchic delirium mistook him for a wild animal.

25–26: the content of the distich is an ἀποπομπή of the type in which a danger is warded off and redirected towards another acquaintance on whom the deity invoked can demonstrate his power (cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.21.13–16, *hic* [scil. *Apollo*] *bellum . . . a populo et principe Caesare in / Persas atque Britannos / vestra motus aget prece*). Lygdamus, then, protects himself from the wrath of Bacchus and requests that it should fall on Neaera. The pronoun *illa* can only refer to Neaera, as is shown by the following lines, in which the poet, regretting the prayer he has made, expresses a wish that it should not be granted (ll. 27–28) and that Neaera should instead be happy (ll. 29–30). The sudden and completely surprising appearance of Neaera in this context is consistent with the dynamic nature of this elegy (see the introduction to the poem). When speaking of divine retribution, Lygdamus impulsively tries to divert the god's wrath onto Neaera, as if she were his worst enemy, undoubtedly because of the hurt she has caused him. The term *illa* which he uses to refer to her (when he has not already named her) is proof that she was clearly in his mind all along. However, the reader does not know exactly who he is referring to until a few lines later, when the poet appeals directly to Neaera, finally calling her by her name. This explains the corruption undergone by the last words of the hexameter. The copyist, being unclear as to who *illa* referred to, has resolved the ambiguity by corrupting *si quis* into *si qua est* (< *si que'st*). The meaning of the distich is: "but may such fear be far from us, and may she, if anyone can (= she

and none other), feel what the wrath of the offended god can do". In view of this, among the many emendations proposed for this much-discussed hexameter-ending—*impia si qua est* (Voss), *iraque si qua est* (Huschke, reading *illa dei* for *ira dei* in the pentameter), *illaque si qua* (Baehrens, followed by Pichard and recently W. S. Watt, *Maia* 43.1 [1991] 15–16), and the ingenious *illaque sicca* of Muretus (Lugduni, 1559, p. 100): «may the wrath of the wine-god fall upon her (= Neaera) in her sobriety!»—*illaque si quis* (Bolle) seems to me to be undoubtedly the best ("she and none other").

procul a nobis: as a preposition, *procul* is found in poetry from Enn. *Scen.* 260, *patria procul*; *Sat.* 50, *dubio procul*, still with the archaic ablative (cf. Hofmann-Szantyr 104 [§ 72 II *Zus.*]); later, now with the ablative of separation (*procul a*), in Acc., Lucr., Catul. (eg 63.92, *procul a mea tuos sit furor omnis, era, domo*), Hor., Ov. (cf. Bömer 322 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.323); in prose from Liv. (in a *locus non satis explicatus* with *ab*; cf. Lease, *AJPh* 30 [1909] 305; then Val.-Max., Colum., Plin., *i.a.*; cf. Hofmann-Szantyr 271 (§ 152).

26 laesi / -˘˘ ira dei: clearly Ovidian in tone (*pace* Büchner, "Lygdamus", p. 506: *metri causa*); cf. Ov. *Tr.* 1.5.84, *ni fuerit laesi* ¦ *mollior ira dei/*, and *Ponto* 1.4.44, *perstiterit laesi* ¦ *si gravis ira dei/*; cf. also Ov. *Tr.* 3.6.23, *numinis . . . laesi . . . ira*; in connection with Bacchus, cf. Ov. *Met.* 4.8, (*sacerdos*) *saevam laesi fore numinis iram / vaticinatus erat.*

For the phrase *ira dei*, cf. *ira deum* in Verg. *Aen.* 3.215; 8.40–41; Ov. *Met.* 10.399; *ira deorum* in Ov. *Met.* 1.378; *Fasti* 5.539; *Tr.* 5.3.13; *Ponto* 1.9.23; in *Tr.* and *Ponto* frequently *ira dei*, ie 'ira Caesaris'; *numinis ira* in Ov. *Met.* 10.239. The expression *laedere deum* is typically Ovidian. However, cf. Catul. 50.21, *est vemens dea* (scil. *Nemesis*): *laedere hanc caveto*; Prop. 2.15.48, *laeserunt nullos proelia nostra deos.* See also the commentary on Lygd. 4.16, *nec laesit magnos impia lingua deos.* The normal expression from Hor. *Epod.* 15.3 is *numen* (*dei* or *deorum*) *laedere*; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.8, *quo numine laeso?*; Tib. 1.9.5–6, *parcite, caelestes: aequum est impune licere / numina formosis laedere vestra semel*; Ov. *Am.* 3.3.4, *numina laesit.*

laesi . . . dei: for *laedere* in connection with the gods, see the commentary on Lygd. 4.16 *laesit.*

sentiat: for the verb *sentire* in the specific sense of "to experience (the power of a deity)", cf. Hor. *Od.* 4.6.3, *dive, quem proles Niobea magnae vindicem linguae Tityosque raptor sensit*; Prop. 1.9.21, *pueri totiens arcum sentire medullis*; Ov. *Am.* 1.9.39 (on the power of Amor), *Mars quoque deprensus fabrilia vincula sensit* (with McKeown 276); 11.11, *sensisse Cupidinis arcus*; 2.9.11 (to Cupid), *nos tua sentimus . . . arma*; *Tr.* 1.5.19,

Augusti numen adora, et, quem sensisti, rite precare deum; Tarrant *ad* Sen. *Ag.* 842.

27a quid precor a demens?: there is a similar rhetorical appeal to reason in [Tib.] 3.19.17, *quid facio demens?*, (with Tränkle 332), and especially in Ov. *Tr.* 5.10.51, *quid loquor a demens?* For the phrase *a demens!*, frequent in poetry, cf. also Verg. *Ecl.* 2.60, *quem fugis a demens?* (cf. 69, *a Corydon Corydon, quae te dementia cepit*); [Verg.] *Cir.* 185 (with Lyne 178); Prop. 2.30.1, *quo fugis a demens?*; Ov. *Ponto* 4.3.29, *quid facis a demens?*.

a: for the written form, the poetic tone, and the almost formulaic use of this interjection in the elegists (generally at the beginning of the line and in highly stereotyped expressions; within the line it can only form part of the phrase *a demens*), cf. Lygd. 4.61–62 (comm.).

demens: not in its usual sense of "mad, demented", but "senseless, foolish" (neither the *ThLL* nor the *OLD* make this distinction; see, however, Bömer 226 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 1.753). According to McKeown 175 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.7.19, the term in poetry is used almost exclusively in the nominative and vocative singular. The only exceptions are Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.135 and *Od.* 3.19.23 (*dementem*); Hor. *Od.* 1.37.7 and Tib. 1.10.56 (*dementes* [acc. pl. fem.]); Prop. 3.8.15 (*dementia* [nom. pl. neut.]); Ov. *Met.* 4.259 (*dementer*). Its frequency in the Augustan poets is not very high; Ov. 22 times (8 *Met.-Fasti*); Verg. 17 (16 *Aen.*); Hor. 7 (2 *Od.*); Tib. 3; Prop. 7. However, the poetic use of *amens* is even more restricted; Ov. 15 (9 *Met.-Fasti*); Verg. 13 (13 *Aen.*); Hor. 1 (0 *Od.*); Tib. 1 (1.6.46); Prop. 1. Only Ovid uses different cases from the nominative and vocative singular (cf. *Ars* 2.691 *amentis*; *Met.* 2.398 *amentes* [acc. pl. masc.]; *Tr.* 3.3.20 *amenti*).

27b–28: as regards the content, this is the proverbial idea of the winds carrying something far away. For this commonplace, see the commentary on Lygd. 4.96. The object swept away by the winds is again *vota* in Tib. 1.5.35–36, *quae nunc Eurusque Notusque / iactat odoratos vota per Armenios.* As for the formulation, Catul. 30.9–10, *tua dicta omnia factaque ventos irrita ferre ac nebulas aereas sinis*, has provided the model for the expressive reduplication of the subject (*venti . . . aeriae et nubes*).

27 temeraria vota: "rash wish", that is, "desire formulated unthinkingly". For the poetic use of the adjective *temerarius*, see the commentary on Lygd. 4.7.

28 aeri(ae) et nubes: for the elision of the final *-ae* diphthong before the copulative conjunction *et*, cf. Prop. 1.2.17, *Id(ae) et cupido*; 2.1.74, *vit(ae) et morti*; 3.22.15, *Ortygi(ae) et visenda*; Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, p. 77.

aeriae . . . nubes: the same phrase is found in Verg. *Aen.* 7.704–705, *aëriam . . . volucrum . . . nubem*; Sil. 17.341, *procul aeria speculantem nube sororem.* The adjective *aerius* is predominantly poetic ('voc. poeticum' according to *ThLL* 1.1061.83–84); for its application to wind and clouds as epithet, cf. also Catul. 30.10 *sup. cit.*; 64.142, *quae cuncta aerii discerpunt irrita venti*; Manil. 1.727, *aeriam in nebulam*; *ThLL* 1.1063.6–8.

diripienda: for the use of this verb in connection with the topos of words carried off by the wind, cf. Prop. 4.7.21–22, *cuius fallacia verba / . . . diripuere Noti.* It is, in addition, a frequent verb to describe the action of the wind; cf. Tib. 1.6.54, *ut hic ventis diripitur . . . cinis*; Stat. *Theb.* 5.367, *venti diripiunt . . . fretum*; *ThLL* 5.1.1262.78–79.

29: the formulation of this line is deliberately reminiscent of Lygd. 1.19–20, *sit nostri mutua cura / an minor an toto pectore deciderim.*

quamvis . . . superest: the construction *quamvis* + indicative, though exceptional in classical prose (cf. Vatin. *frg.* Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.60; in post-classical Latin from Sen. *Suas.* 1.12; Val.-Max. 2.2.7), is frequent in poetry from Lucretius (eg 3.403; 415; 705; 4.426) and Catul. 12.5 (cf. also Verg. *Ecl.* 3.84; *Aen.* 5.542; Hor. *Od.* 1.28.11–13; 3.7.25–28; 18.13–16; *Ep.* 1.14.6; 17.1; 18.59; 2.2.168; *Poet.* 355; 366–367; *Sat.* 1.3.129; 2.2.29; 2.5.15); in Lucan only in *Civ.* 4.247 (9 times with the subjunctive; cf. Barratt 222 *ad* Luc. *Civ.* 5.666). As regards the elegists, in the *Corp. Tib.* its only other occurrence with the indicative is [Tib.] 3.14.8 (with Smith 510). Tibullus uses this conjunction four times, always with the subjunctive (1.4.41; 43; 6.67–68; 8.15; in 1.8.59 *quamvis* strictly modifies *media . . . nocte*, not *possum*, according to Smith 357 *ad loc.*). In Propertius it is used four times, with the indicative (1.18.13; 2.8.27; 24.37–38; 3.19.28). In Ovid, the normal construction is with the indicative (eg *Am.* 1.15.14; 2.1.28; 5.60; 3.4.23; 6.47; 13.5–6; 14.14; *Her.* 7.29; 13.117; 18.50; *Ars* 2.213; *Met.* 1.686; 2.177; 568; 782; 3.170; *Fasti* 2.485; 777; 3.69; 4.515; *Ponto* 3.2.95; 4.6.31; *i.a.*). On this point, cf. Ernout-Robin *ad* Lucr. 2.205; Bömer 287 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.177; 116–117 *ad* Ov. *Fasti* 2.485; E. B. Lease, *AJPh* 30 (1909) 306; E. Schaffner, *Die Entwicklung des lat. Adv. 'quamvis' zur Konjunktion*, 1954; Kühner-Stegmann II.2.442–443. (§§ 5–6); Hofmann-Szantyr 604 (§ 326). In the whole of love elegy, the alternative conjunction *quamquam* only appears in Ov. *Her.* 19.58 (to avoid the cacophonic *quamvis non vis*); cf. Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, pp. 123–124. For *quamquam* + subjunctive, cf. Bömer 163 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 14.465, *quamquam . . . renoventur*; for *quamvis* + adjective, see Lygd. 6.56 (comm.).

mei . . . cura: "your love for me". The genitives in *-i* of the personal pronouns and the reflexive are generally used with an objective force (cf. Kühner-Stegmann 2.1.597–598; Ernout-Thomas 41 180 (§ 208); Bassols I.190 [§ 175]). For this and other elegiac senses of the term *cura*, see the commentary on Lygd. 1.19.

tibi: dative governed by the compounds of *sum* (*superest*).

cura, Neaera: the point has been made that in using this *iunctura* (= Lygd. 2.29, *dolor et cura Neaerae/*) Lygdamus is echoing Verg. *Ecl.* 10.22, *inquit 'tua cura, Lycoris / . . .* In addition, in both passages of Lygdamus the metrical position is the same as in Virgil. However, D. O. Ross (*Style and Tradition in Catullus* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press 1969], p. 52) showed that in *Ecl.* 10.22—where Virgil is translating Theocr. 1.82—*cura*, a wordplay on the Greek noun κώρα, is used in the new sense of *amica*; subsequently he even suggested (id., *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome* [Cambridge 1975] 69) that the wordplay came from Gallus. In Lygd. 6.29 there is no such neoteric play: the substitution of *tibi* for Virgil's *tua* not only weakens the Virgilian echo but restores the literal meaning to *cura*. Lygdamus was either unaware of the wordplay *cura/amica* underlying the Virgilian eclogue, or did not understand it. In Lygd. 2.29–30 the expression *cura Neaerae / coniugis ereptae* is more ambivalent, as there *cura* is virtually synonymous with *amor*; cf. M. Parca, "The Position of Lygdamus in Augustan Poetry", *St. in Lat. Lit. & Rom. Hist.* 4 (1986) 468–469.

30 sis felix: for the use of this formula or the like to wish good luck, cf. Catul. 68.155; 100.8, */sis felix, Caeli, sis in amore potens*; Verg. *Aen.* 3.493; Hor. *Od.* 3.27.13; Prop. 1.13.35.

candida fata: ie *laeta, bona, felicia.* The formulation recalls the Catullan *candidi tibi soles* (8.3 and 8). The same or similar expressions only appear in any significant way in the late works of Ovid; cf. *Tr.* 3.4.34, *fato candidiore frui*; 5.7.4, *candida fortunae pars manet una meae*; *Ponto* 2.4.30, *pars fati candida nulla mei est*; Fletcher 50. Note the studied alliteration in the second half of the pentameter (*candida fata tua*). For *candidus* = *laetus*, see the commentary on Lygd. 3.25 *niveam.*

31–32: a further exhortation to the festive partying spirit in order to dispel the nostalgic thoughts of love into which he has again fallen. The adversative particle */at* (l. 31), like *sed* in l. 17, underlines this return to the sympotic theme.

31: "but let us return its own time to the banquet, free from all care". For the expression *tempus* (*red*)*dare* in connection with a ban-

quet, cf. Ov. *Met.* 7.661–663, *talibus atque aliis longum sermonibus illi / implevere diem; lucis pars optima mensae / est data, nox somnis.*

securae: for the elegiac sense of the adjective *se-curus* ("free of care", "with no concerns"), see the commentary on Lygd. 3.31 and Pichon, p. 260.

tempora mensae: the same line-ending in Ov. *Ponto* 4.6.47, though *mensae* there is genitive. The time reserved for dinner-parties was the last hours of daylight, well into the evening; cf. Hom. *Od.* 11.373–374; 12.308 ff.; 311; Verg. *Aen.* 1.723; 4.77 ff.; Ov. *Met.* 7.662–663, *lucis pars ultima mensae est data, nox somnis* (with Bömer 364); Val.-Flac. 2.347, *sacris dum vincitur extis prima fames . . . dapibus coeptis mox tempora fallunt noctis et in seras durant sermonibus umbras*; Luc. *Civ.* 10.103 ff.

mensae: ie *convivium* from Enn. *Ann.* 235, *quocum . . . mensam sermonesque . . . impertit*; until Val.-Max 5.1.8 exclusively poetic; cf. Turpil. *Com.* 201, *coronam, mensam, talos, vinum*; Verg. *Ecl.* 4.63; Ov. *Ars* 1.594, *mensa merumque*; *Met.* 7.663 *sup. cit.* (with Bömer 364–365).

32: within the wide range of metaphors connected with changing time to refer to the ups and downs of human fortune, this is a reference to the familiar proverbial idea that "after the storm comes the calm" (or "after the rain the sun will shine"), which is recalled in bad times, by way of consolation, inspiring hope in a change for the better; cf. Pi. *P.* 5.10–11, εὐδίανὸς (Κάστωρ) μετὰ χειμέριον ὄμβρον τεὰν / καταιθύσσει μάκαιραν ἑστίαν; E. *HF* 101–102, κάμνουσι γάρ τοι καὶ βροτῶν αἱ συμφοραί, / καὶ πνεύματ' ἀνέμων οὐκ ἀεὶ ῥώμην ἔξει; *Fr.* 330.6–7 N., οὕτω δὲ θνητῶν σπέρμα τῶν μὲν εὐτυχεῖ / λαμπρᾷ γαλήνῃ, τῶν δὲ συννέφει πάλιν; *Com. Adesp. Fr.* 118.4 K.; Theocr. 4.43, χὠ Ζεὺς ἄλλοκα μὲν πέλει αἄθριος, ἄλλοκα δ' ὕει; Acc. *Trag.* 260, *splendet saepe, ast idem nimbis interdum nigret*; Hor. *Od.* 1.7.15–18, *albus ut obscuro deterget nubila caelo / saepe Notus neque parturit imbris / perpetuo, sic tu sapiens finire memento / tristitiam vitaeque labores*; 2.9.1–2, *non semper imbres nubibus hispidos / manant in agros* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 139); Ov. *Fasti* 1.495–496, *nec fera tempestas toto tamen horret in anno, / et tibi, crede mihi, tempora veris erunt* (with Bömer 56); *Tr.* 2.142, *nube solet pulsa candidus ire dies*; 5.8.31–32; *Ponto* 4.4.1–2; Sen. *Ep.* 107.8, *nubilo serena succedunt*; [Plut.] *Cons. Apoll.* 103 b; cf. Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 113 s.v. *dies* 2 [531].

As regards the text, the *multas* of the mss. arouses justifiable suspicion for two reasons: a) the line seems to be missing the express reference to cloudy or rainy weather that is traditional in *sententiae* of this kind; b) even though it is true that it is always possible to

understand *post multas non serenas* (from *serena* 'e contrario'), the feminine use of *dies* in the plural is unusual (in Lygdamus it is always masculine; cf. 4.54; 5.28; 6.54). Following the *recentiores*, most editors substitute *multos* for the feminine. The change of gender within the line can be explained by the fact that *post multos* (or *paucos*) *dies* is a set phrase (for a similar change of gender in *dies*, cf. Ov. *Met.* 6.435 ff.). Of the various conjectures proposed which involve a radical alteration of the term transmitted, the most widely accepted are *nimbos* (Santen), which has the advantage of referring expressly to bad weather (an overcast sky with rain-clouds), and *pluvias* (Housman); but both conjectures are too far-removed from the manuscript tradition.

32 una serena dies: in its strict sense *dies* ("day" in opposition to "period" [f.]) is generally masculine, in view of which *unus serenus dies* might be more to be expected; but Lygdamus uses qualifying adjectives and numerals in the feminine for obvious metrical reasons, as is the case in Verg. *Aen.* 6.429, *atra dies*; 745, *longa dies* (however, when the feminine presents no such metrical advantages, Virgil prefers the masculine; cf. *Aen.* 2.249, *ille dies* (= 4.169); 6.70, *festosque dies*; on the whole question, see E. Fraenkel, "Das Geschlecht von *dies*", *Glotta* 8 [1917] 24 ff. [= *Kleine Beiträge zur Klass. Philol.* 1 (1964) 27–72.]; Austin 69–70 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 4.169; Norden 245 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 6.429; Nisbet *ad* Cic. *Domo* 45; Barratt 203–204 *ad* Luc. *Civ.* 5.616 *ille dies*; Hofmann, *Philologus* 93 (1938) 265 ff. Fraenkel, *art. cit.*, concludes that in classical prose the masculine only denotes 'a single day' (cf. Nisbet *ad* Cic. *Domo.* 45). In his examination of the use of *dies* by the poets (p. 60 ff.) he shows how metrical convenience can make them deviate from prose usage.

una: with the force of an indefinite article (≈ *quidam*) as in Ov. *Her.* 15.162, *constitit ante oculos Naias una meos*; *Met.* 1.690; *Fasti* 5.664. In Tibullus, on the other hand, the numeral *unus* always keeps its original sense of "only one" (cf. 1.2.9; 60; 90). This indefinite value of *unus* originated in everyday language, arising from its emphatic use with superlatives (eg Pl. *As.* 521, *quid ais tu, quam ego unam vidi mulierem audacissumam?*; *OLD unus* 8b); in addition to the archaic authors, it is attested in Catul., Cic. (eg *Phil.* 2.7), Caes., Val.-Max., Curt. and in great profusion in late and vulgar Latin; cf. Hofmann, *Latín familiar*, p. 153 (§ 97); Hofmann-Szantyr 193 (§ 106 d).

33–36: is difficult to feign joy. In these lines Lygdamus makes clear to us his real mood, *tristis et sollicitus*, for all his repeated efforts to pretend to be cheerful. As regards the formulation, note, on the one

hand, the double anaphora: a) *difficile est* . . . / *difficile est*, clearly Catullan in tone (cf. 76.13–14, *difficile est longum subito deponere amorem; difficile est, verum hoc qua lubet efficias*), and *nec bene* . . . / *nec bene*; and, on the other, the lexical variation (synonymy) in the terms referring to falseness (*imitari*, *fingire*, *componitur*, *falsa*, *mendaci*) and to happiness/sadness (*gaudia*, *iocum*, *risu*, *ebria verba*; *sollicitis*, *tristi*). Note how in the first distich the viewpoint is that of someone attempting to "put a brave face on things"; in the second, we see the outward signs that give the lie to this forced good cheer.

33 ei mihi: exclamation of self-pity much to the liking of Ovid, and it looks like a lively colloquial touch (*ei* and *ei mihi* are common in Comedy and though they occur only in poetry they are rare in higher genres until Silver Latin; see *ThLL* 5.2.299.43 ff.). According to statistics by McKeown 149 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.6.52, it is found 46 times in Ovid: 7 in *Met.* (5) and *Fasti* (2); 39 in the other works, 26 of these occurrences being in his *opera amatoria* (cf. also Bömer 164 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 1.523); in Virgil, only three times, all in the *Aeneid* (eg 2.274 [with Austin 130]); twice in Tibullus (2.1.70; 6.28 [with Murgatroyd 257]); three times in Propertius (1.3.38; 4.1.58; 8.48); once in the *Annales* of Ennius; 24 times in Plautus; 19 in Terence; once in the *Trag.* of Accius; never in Horace, Catullus, Lucretius, the tragedies of Seneca, or Lucan; 6 times in Val.-Flac.; twice in Sil.; 15 times in Statius (3 in the *Silv.*); once in Mart.; never in Juv.; cf. also [Verg.] *Cir.* 237. It often appears in the more developed form *ei mihi quod* (eg Prop. 4.1.58; Ov. *Am.* 2.3.1; *Met.* 1.523; *Tr.* 3.2.23 [with Luck 175]; Val.-Flac. 7.276; Stat. *Theb.* 12.99; *Silv.* 5.3.225; Dracont. *Laud.* 3.592). The expression never appears in classical prose; in poetry it tends to occupy the beginning of the line (cf. *ThLL* 5.2.300.79–80); cf. Hofmann, *Latín familiar*, pp. 17–18 (§ 12).

imitari gaudia falsa: for the formulation, cf. Sen. *Oed.* 419, (scil. *Bacchus virginis forma sumpta*) *falsos imitatus artus*; cf. also Tac. *Ann.* 1.24, *vultu, quamquam maestitiam imitarentur, contumaciae propiores*. For the expression *gaudia falsa*, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.513–514 (Deiphobus to Aeneas), *ut supremam falsa inter gaudia noctem / egerimus, nosti*; Ov. *Her.* 13.106, *dum careo veris, gaudia falsa iuvant.*

34 iocum: "good humour, joking"; cf. l. 20, *vina iocosa*, and Pichon, p. 175.

35 mendaci . . . ore: the same expression is only found elsewhere—according to Fletcher 50; *ThLL* 8.703.35–36—in Ov. *Am.* 3.3.44 and *Met.* 9.322 (here in the same position in the line; with Bömer 374),

which in the view of Axelson ("Lygd. & Ovid", p. 106) argues in favour of Lygdamus being later than Ovid; in the opinion of Büchner ("Lygdamus", p. 505) no conclusions can be drawn, as Lygdamus also shares a number of expressions exclusively with Virgil: *cithara sonora, Lyaeus annosus, garrula lyra, Panchaia dives, ratis Lethaea, membrana lutea*; for the *iuncturae* common to Lygdamus and Ovid alone (like *ebria verba*, l. 36), cf. S. Kleemann, *De libri tertii carminibus, quae Tibulli nomine circumferuntur*, Strassburg 1876.

componitur: ie *simulatur, fingitur*; cf. [Tib.] 3.13[= 4.7].9–10, *voltus componere famae / taedet*; Sen. *Dial.* 12 (*Consol. ad Helv.*) 16, *per ipsum tamen compositum fictumque vultum lacrimae profunduntur.*

36 sollicitis: for the elegiac sense of this term, see the commentary on Lygd. 4.20 and l. 61 below.

36 ebria verba: the same phrase is only attested elsewhere (according to Fletcher 50; *ThLL* 5.2 14.52–53) in Ov. *Fasti* 6.408, *cantat, et ad nautas ebria verba iacit* (in the same position in the line); for expressions common to Lygdamus and Ovid alone, cf. l. 35 *mendaci ore* (comm.).

The meaning of *ebria verba* is also made clear by another passage of Ovid; cf. Ov. *Her.* 16.247–248, *ut possem verbis petulantius uti, / non semel ebrietas est simulata mihi.* Note the onomatopoeic 'iunctura' reproducing the hesitant stammering and bumbled gabbling which reveal a man's drunken condition.

37–38: further appeal to the festive spirit. *Tristitia* in word or thought has no place at a dinner-party.

37 quid queror infelix?: picks up l. 27, *quid precor a demens?*

turpes discedite curas: another attempt to dispel all cares (πρόρρησις), as in l. 7 (comm.) and in l. 52. This use of *discedere* is only attested in Ov. *Met.* 10.336, *spes interdictae discedite!*; subsequently, from Liv. 4.52.8, *sollicitudines discessere*, 'persaepe de affectibus' (*ThLL* 5.1.1283.78 ff.).

turpes . . . curas: a strikingly unusual combination. The lover's cares or worries (*curae*) are described as *turpes* either because elegiac love or the *servitium amoris* is degrading or because his feebleness at the moment of *discidium* disgraces him. For *turpis* in the *sermo amatorius*, cf. Pichon, pp. 285–286; Lygd. 4.15 (comm.); for *cura*, cf. Lygd. 1.19 (comm.).

38: seriousness and wine do not go together; cf. Tib. 1.7.43–44, *non tibi sunt tristes curae nec luctus, Osiri* (= *Bacche*), */ sed chorus et cantus et levis aptus amor.*

Lenaeus . . . pater: this term is applied to Bacchus only in Verg.

Ge. 2.4 and 7 (*pater o Lenaee*), in Ov. *Met.* 11.132, and in Col. *Rust.* 10.430, in all these passages in the vocative (*ThLL* 10.1.686.3–5). *Lenaeus* (Ληναῖος), "the one of the wine-press" (Gr. ληνός; Lat. *torculum*), is the epithet for Bacchus as god of wine-production; cf. Serv. *Ge.* 2.4; *Aen.* 4.207; [Prob.] *Ge.* 2.2; Maltby, *LALE*, p. 333; the epithet has clear Athenian connotations: held in his honour in Attica, in the month of December, were the Λήναια, the "festival of the wine-press", when the first produce of the grape-harvest was offered to the god. Virgil addresses him as such, for the first time in Roman literature, at the beginning of the second *Georgic* (ll. 4–8):

Huc, ***pater o Lenaee*** *(tuis hic omnia plena*
muneribus, tibi pampineo gravidus autumno
floret ager, spumat plenis vindemia labris),
huc, ***pater o Lenaee****, veni, nudaque musto*
tinge novo mecum dereptis crura coturnis.

The late appearance of this epithet—which may be Asian (Lydian) in origin—in both the Latin context and the Greek (Ληνεύς from *SIG*³ 1024.24 Mykonos c. 200 BC; Ληναῖος from Diod. 4.5.1) is quite striking; cf. Kock, *RE* 12.2 1940.62 ff.; Frisk *GEW* II 117; Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* II (1931) 63; H. Jeanmaire, *Dionysos. Histoire du culte de Bacchus* (Paris: Payot 1951) 44 ff. (review by Nilsson, *Gnomon* 25 [1953] 274–276); M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der Griechischen Religion* I³ (1967) 575–576; 584; Maltby, *LALE*, p. 333; *Lenaeus* is not only late but infrequent; apart from the *loci* cited, cf. also Verg. *Ge.* 2.529; 3.510; *Aen.* 4.207; Hor. *Od.* 3.25.19; Ov. *Met.* 4.14 (with n. by Bömer 17); *Ib.* 329 (here in reference to Mithridates VI, who was given the sobriquet of *Dionysus*; cf. Burmann, Ellis, La Penna *ad loc.*); *AL* 751.1, *Lenaee vitisator.*

The most comprehensive list of all the epithets of Bacchus is to be found in Ov. *Met.* 4.11–17 (cf. l. 14, *et cum Lenaeo genialis consitor uvae*). For *Lyaeus*, see Lygd. 2.19 (comm.).

The title of *pater* is frequently applied to Bacchus in Latin poetry from Enn. *Scen.* 123, *Bacchus pater* (the same expression in Hor. *Od.* 1.18.6; 3.3.13; Ov. *Met.* 13.669 [with Bömer 379]; Tib. 2.3.66; Prop. 3.17.1–2; Capel. 1.1); in the form *Liber pater* from Lucil. 21 (= Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.128; *CIL* I² 2289; 2290; Varro *Rust.* 1.2.19; Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.5; Ov. *Fasti* 3.512 (with Bömer 178); 761; 789; Curt. 8.5.8, *i.a.*; cf. Serv. *Ge.* 2.4, *'pater' licet generale sit omnium deorum, tamen proprie Libero semper coharet* (codd. et *ThLL* 3.1539.35: *inhaeret* Bruhl), *nam Liber pater vocatur;*

Macr. *Sat.* 1.19.3); in the form *pater Lyaeus* in Verg. *Aen.* 4.58 (= Sil. 7.201); for other parallel expressions, cf. Acc. *Trag.* 241–242, *pater, vitisator, Semela genitus, Euhie!*; Ov. *Ars* 1.567, *Nyctelium . . . patrem*; Stat. *Theb.* 4.383, *omnipotens Nysaee pater*, *ThLL* 10.1.685.678–686.6; as *parens* only in Ov. *Met.* 4.15 (with Bömer 18–19). In general, "the term *pater* is often given to gods and heroes, as a mark of respect" (Austin 42 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 4.58); in connection with *Iuppiter*, cf. Lyg. 4.48 (comm.); cf. also Carter, *Epitheta deorum*, 61.

tristia verba: clearly counterpoint to the *ebria verba* of l. 36, but also related to the *seria verba* of l. 52.

39–56: long digression on the theme of the *perfidia Neaerae*. The order of ideas is by no means clear. The poet begins 'ex abrupto' with an apostrophe to Ariadne, abandoned in Naxos by the treacherous Theseus, as a mythological 'exemplum' of perfidy. He then presses his friends to learn from the errors of others and not to place any trust in the oaths of women and, having exhorted himself once more to abandon serious discourse, he reaffirms his love for Neaera, however perfidious she may be.

39–42: 'ex abrupto' account of the myth of Ariadne, daughter of the king of Crete, Minos (hence the patronymic *Minois*, l. 41), whose capital was in Cnossos (hence *Cnosia*, l. 39), and who was abandoned by Theseus on the island of Naxos and then aided by Dionysus, who took her as his wife. The commentators are struck by the fact that Lygdamus has chosen this myth to exemplify treacherous behaviour, when it is Theseus who abandons Ariadne, and that the poet then warns his friends against the *perfidia muliebris*. The fact that Ariadne was then assisted by Dionysus might have prompted him to make the choice; this would then be an example of the aretalogy of the god invoked: "Just as you helped the abandoned Ariadne, help me too." In his choice of myth (pathetic function), Lygdamus takes up the position of other Roman poets who exploit the Alexandrian image of the woman abandoned by husband or lover. Note similar scenes in Catul. 64 132 ff. and 249–250 (Ariadne and Theseus), a passage of Catullus to which Lygdamus expressly refers (ll. 41–42); Prop. 1.15.9–14 (Calypso and Ulysses); Verg. *Aen.* 4.296–392 (Dido and Aeneas) and 6.475–476; Ov. *Her.* 12.159 ff. (Medea and Jason); *Ars* 2.125–143 (Calypso and Ulysses); *Met.* 11.421–473 (Alcyone and Ceyx); Apul. *Met.* 5.25 (Cupid and Psyche). Clear echoes of the Catullan epyllion, his obvious model, are *periuria* (l. 39; cf. Catul. 64.135) and *Minoi* (l. 41; cf. Catul. 64.60).

39 Gnosia: Ariadne, so called because she was the daughter of Minos, king of Crete, the main city of which was Cnossos. The adjective is undoubtedly used here, as often (cf. Catul. 64.172 [with Fordyce 299]; Verg. *Ge.* 1.222), as an equivalent to "Cretan" (like *Gortynia* in Catul. 64.75; Verg. *Aen.* 6.60; 11.773; [Verg.] *Cir.* 114 [with Lyne 149]); as a *gentilicium* of Ariadne, it is frequent in Ovid (cf. *Her.* 15.25 [*Gnosida*]; *Ars* 1.525; 554; 3.158). The form of the name of the Cretan capital found on coins is Νωσός or Κνωσσός; but in Latin, apart from *Cnossus*, the form *Gnossus* evolved (like *Progne* from Πρόκνη and *Gnidus* from Κνίδος; cf. F. Sommer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre* [Heidelberg: Winter 1948³] 233). The codices and most editors of the *Corp. Tib.* have *Gnosia* here. In the Augustan period both forms, *Gnossus* and *Cnossus*, were used, as attested by contemporary coinage. Although some editors prefer *Cnosia* (cf. Kenney *ad* Ov. *Ars* 1.293), like most (eg Bömer, *Gymnasium* 64 [1957] 126–127) I have chosen to keep the ms. reading *Gnosia*, in view of the post-Augustan dating for Lygdamus: while *Cnossus* is the oldest form, and even survives into the post-Augustan period, *Gnossus* is only to be found in this post-classical period (cf. A. E. Housman, "Prosody and Method II. The Metrical Properties of *Gn*", *CQ* 22 [1928] 7); cf. also Hor. *Od.* 1.15.17; Bömer 504 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 3.208; 118–119 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 6.412–674; Tarrant 364 s.v. *Cnosius.*

Theseae . . . periuria linguae: for the treachery of the perjurer Theseus, cf. E. *Med.* 21 ff.; 492; A. R. 4.357 ff.; Nonn. 47.389; Catul. 64.58–59, *inmemor et iuvenis fugiens pellit vada remis, / irrita ventosae linquens promissa procellae*; 132–135, *sicine me patriis avectam, perfide, ab aris, / perfide, deserto liquisti in litore, Theseu? / sicine discedens neglecto numine divum, / immemor a! devota domum periuria portas?*; Ov. *Am.* 1.7.15, *talis periuri promissaque velaque Thesei*; *Her.* 4.59, *perfide Aegides*; 10.76, *femina periuri fraude sepulta viri*; *Ars* 3.457, *parcite, Cecropides, iuranti credere Theseo*; *Fasti* 3.461, *iam bene periuro mutarat coniuge Bacchum*; 473, *periure et perfide Theseu* (with Bömer 176); 487; *Ib.* 495. In contrast, because of his friendship with Pirithous, Theseus is a paradigm of faithfulness; cf. Hom. *Od.* 11.630; Ov. *Tr.* 1.3.66; *Ponto* 4.10.78; Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 1890 n° 1779; Van Dam 424 *ad* Stat. *Silv.* 2.6.54–55. For the phrase *periuria linguae*, cf. Ov. *Her.* 7(*Dido Aeneae*).67, *falsae periuria linguae/* (also at the end of a hexameter). *Periuria*: Hor. 0; Verg. 2 (*Ge.* 1.502; *Aen.* 4.542); *Ciris* 2; Tib. 3 (1.3.51; 1.4.21; 1.9.3); Prop. (1.15.25); Ov. 14: *Met.* 3 (11.206 [with Bömer 292]; 14.91; 99); elsewhere 11; Lygd. 2 (6.39; 49). In Virgil, Tibullus and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, *periuria* always

occupies the same place in the hexameter, after the hephthemimeral caesura, as in the present *locus Lygdameus* (though not in Lygd. 6.49).

quondam: for the use of this adverb at the beginning of the account of a myth as a formula with which to relate it to a remote and legendary past (like *olim*), see Lygd. 4.67 (comm.). With the *nunc* of l. 43 there is a return to the present. For the *quondam/nunc* opposition in Lygdamus, cf. Lygd. 1.23, *vir quondam, nunc frater* (here also indicating a change in fortune).

40 flevisti ignoto sola relicta mari: "you wept, lonely and abandoned, to an unknown sea". The poetic image of weeping in the face of the sea, that is, in the presence of no-one, as an expression of the most absolute solitude, is previously found in Prop. 1.15.10, (*Calypso*) *desertis olim fleverat aequoribus* (with Hollstein, *De monobibli Prop. sermone et de tempore quo scripta sit* [Marburg 1911] 38; Shackleton Bailey *Prop.* 42; Fedeli *Prop.* I 343, who interpret *desertis . . . aequoribus* as a dative, against the majority of Propertian scholars, who take this to be a locative ablative). The lament of the hapless lover to the elements of nature in lonely spots, beyond the reach of other human beings, is a Hellenistic bucolic motif that comes from the frequent invocations to rocks and caves in Greek tragedy. It is a favourite topos in bucolic and elegiac poetry. Recall the lamentation of Corydon in Verg. *Ecl.* 2.1–5, inspired by that of the Cyclops in Theocritus (*Idyll.* 11.17–79); of Cornelius Gallus (Verg. *Ecl.* 10.52–54); of Milanion in Prop. 1.1.14, (*Milanion*) *saucius Arcadiis rupibus ingemuit*, whose model is probably Cornelius Gallus, as in the first bucolic of Virgil; and that of Propertius himself in 1.18.1–4 (with F. Solmsen *CPh* 57 [1962] 73–88; Enk *Prop.* I [Leiden: Brill 1946] 159–161; Fedeli *Prop.* I 417–418 [= *ANRW* II 30.3, Berlin-New York 1983, pp. 1905–1906]; A. Ramírez de Verger, *Propertius. Elegías* [Madrid: Gredos 1989] 109).

As regards the formulation of this pentameter, in addition to the influence of the Catullan model (*desertam in sola miseram se cernat harena*, l. 57; *me . . . / perfide deserto liquisti in litore*, ll. 132–133), Prop. 1.3.1–2, *Thesea iacuit cedente carina . . . Cnosia*, and especially Ov. *Ars* 3.35–36, *quantum in te, Theseu, volucres Ariadna marinas / pavit, in ignoto sola relicta loco/*, are also significantly close.

flevisti ignoto . . . mari: the dative depending on *flere* (dative of interest, according to Gudeman, *ThLL* 6.900.44; in place of *coram* + ablative, according to Hofmann-Szantyr 96) is limited to Augustan and post-Augustan poetry, with the exception of Pl. *Ps.* 100, *nisi tu lacrumis fleveris argenteis*; cf. also Tib. 1.10.64, *quoi tenera irato flere puella*

potest; 2.5.103, *suae* (scil. *puellae*) *plorabit*; [Verg.] *Cir.* 359–360, *nunc regis amicis / . . . torvum flet maesta parentem*; in Propertius, as noted by Fedeli *Prop.* I 297, the use is limited to the earliest phase of his poetic activity (1.12.15, *felix, qui potuit praesenti flere puellae*; 15.10 *desertis olim fleverat aequoribus*; 20.16, *indomito fleverat Ascanio*); Stat. *Theb.* 11.108, *fertur . . . solus . . . flere sibi.* On the "dative of presence" instead of *coram* + ablative, cf. Lenchantin de Gubernatis, *RFIC* 61 (1933) 107. Damsté 208–209 resolves the ambiguity of *ignoto . . . mari* (dative or locative?), by introducing into the text the more explicit, though less expressive conjecture of Guyetus *flevit in ignoto*: the poetic image of weeping to the sea is lost, as is the pathos of the direct appeal to Ariadne (*Cnosia* in l. 39 would then be nominative, instead of vocative).

flevist(i) ignoto: for the elision of a final -*ī* before an initial *ī*-, cf. Tib. 1.2.56, *s(i) in molli*; Prop. 2.6.21, *docuist(i) impune*; 3.6.39, *consimil(i) impositum*; "Ovid has eight instances" (Platnauer, *Latin Elegiac Verse*, p. 76).

ignoto . . . mari: Lygdamus takes the adjective *ignoto* from Ov. *Ars.* 3.36 (*locus sup. cit.*) and applies it to the sea, though not the Cretan sea familiar to Ariadne. Some editors interpret *ignoto . . . mari* as depending on *sola relicta*, which impoverishes the line.

41 sic: Voss proposed the reading *sed*, found in some mss., with the meaning 'vir te decepit, sed vir etiam te defendit'.

cecinit: *vox propria* for the action of "telling a story" in verse; note the etymology of *carmen* (< **can-men* < cano + -men); cf. Lucil. 621, *facta Corneli cane*; Lucr. 1.117; 2.660; 5.327; 405; Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.80; Verg. *Ge.* 1.12; *Aen.* 1.1, *arma virumque cano*; Hor. *Od.* 1.32.10; Ov. *Tr.* 5.11.24; *Ponto* 3.9.35; 4.8.56; [Verg.] *Aetna* 92; Manil. 1.22; Val.-Flac. 5.224; Luc. *Civ.* 1.2; Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.256; 2.1.17; 7.5; 4.4.71; *Theb.* 10.829; *OLD cano* 3; *ThLL* 3.269.12 ff.

doctus . . . Catullus: the epithet *doctus* had already been applied to Catullus in Ovid's *Amores* (3.9.62), and subsequently several times by Martial (1.61.1; 7.99.7; 8.73.8; 14.100.1; 152.1). The adjective *doctus* is generally applied to a person in view of his literary learning and ability, in particular—especially after Catullus—a person capable of composing poetry. In this more restricted sense *doctus* is an obvious attempt to translate the epithet σοφός as applied to the learned poets by Greek and Hellenistic writers (cf. Sol. 12.52 Crus.; B. *Fr.* 9 Crus.; M. Bowra, *Pindar* [1964] 5–6); cf. Nisbet-Hubbard 13 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 1.1.29; Cairns, *Tibullus*, pp. 11–12. The poet is "wise", but his

wisdom is the fruit of acquired ability as well as innate capacity. For *doctus* as applied frequently to poets or anything connected with poetry (the elegiac beloved, the Muses, cities renowned for learning, etc.), cf. Catul. 35.17, *Sapphica puella musa doctior*; 65.2, *doctis . . . virginibus* (= *Musis*); Hor. *Od.* 1.1.29, *doctarum hederae praemia frontium*; Tib. 1.4.61, *Pieridas, pueri, doctos et amate poetas* (with Murgatroyd 152); [Tib.] 3.12.2, *docta puella* (with n. by Smith 502); Prop. 1.7.11, *doctae . . . puellae* (= 2.13.11); 3.21.28, *docte Menandre*; Ov. *Am.* 2.4.17; *Ars* 2.281; *Met.* 5.555, *doctae Sirenes*; *Tr.* 3.7.31, (*Perilla*) *doctissima* (with Luck 202); Mart. 1.70.15, *quam Phoebus amet doctaeque sorores*; 5.78.14, *docta Neapolis*; 7.69.10; 9.42.3; Stat. *Silv.* 2.7.12, *docti . . . amnes* (= the springs of Mt. Helicon); 76, *docti furor arduus Lucreti*; *ThLL* 5.1.1753.80 ff. ('de puellis'); 1757.12 ff.; 1758.17 ff.; *OLD doctus* 3; for the Muses, cf. also Lygd. 4.45 *doctaeque sorores* (comm.). For a discussion of the term, see F. Cupaiuolo, *Tra poesia e poetica* (1966) 129–130. The term *doctus* often carries a note of refined taste and elegance ("cultured"), which is very much in evidence when the beloved is described as *docta puella* (cf. Catul. 35.17 [with Quinn 197]; Ov. *Am.* 2.4.17–18), or the term is applied to the poet in contrast to the coarse and common *dives amator* (with Murgatroyd 152 *ad* Tib. 1.4.61–62).

This is also the only reference in Lygdamus to a predecessor, "allusion dont conviendra qu'elle ne brille pas par un excès d'originalité, *doctus* étant, dès l'antiquité, l'épithète la plus couramment appliquée au Véronais, justement célèbre aussi pour avoir chanté les malheurs d'Ariane, fille de Minos, dans son fameux poème 64" (A. Foulon, "L'art poétique de Tibulle", *REL* 68 [1990] 71). This lack of allusions to earlier poets is also a characteristic feature of the poetry of his model Tibullus, in contrast with the numerous references (23) in Propertius (five to Homer and Callimachus, four to Philetas, two to Ennius, Calvus and Catullus, and one each to Mimnermus, Pindar and Virgil); cf. Foulon, *loc. cit.*

42 ingrati: "ungrateful". A reference to the ingratitude of Theseus towards Ariadne, thanks to whom the hero succeeded in the feat of killing the Minotaur. Ariadne, who was madly in love with Theseus, gave the hero a clue of thread which enabled him to find his way back out of the Laberynth. As a condition for helping Theseus, Ariadne had insisted on his marrying her and taking her away from her native land. But according to the most famous version of the legend, the ungrateful Theseus, taking advantage of having to call in at the island of Naxos, left her lying asleep on the beach. On waking up,

Ariadne could only see the sail of the thankless Theseus' boat disappearing on the horizon. In its elegiac sense, *ingratus* is anyone who does not repay the trials of love (*officia amoris*) undergone by his or her partner. Ariadne bore witness to her boundless love for Theseus by helping the hero against her own father and brother. Theseus, on the other hand, refused to repay her by marrying her and taking her to Athens. The motif of the ingratitude of the beloved is a topos of erotic poetry; cf. Catul. 73.3, *omnia sunt ingrata* (with Fordyce 364); 76.6, *ingrato amore*; Prop. 1.6.10, *ingrato . . . viro* (with Fedeli 174–175); 4.7.31, *cur ventos non ipse rogis, ingrate, petisti?*; for the elegiac sense of the term *ingratus*, cf. R. Reitzenstein, *Zur Sprache der lateinischen Erotik*, Sitzungsber. Heidelb. Akad. Wiss., Philol.-hist. Kl., Winter 1912, 12, p. 19 ("*ingratum esse* ist schwerer sittlicher Vorwurf und bereichtigt zur Lösung der Freundschaft"); Pichon, p. 169. Lygdamus takes the description of Theseus as *ingratus* from Ov. *Fasti* 3.462; in contrast, the adjective preferred by Catullus to indicate the ingratitude of Theseus is *immemor* (64.58; 123; 135; 248).

impia facta: a Catullan expression (cf. Catul. 23.10; 30.4, *facta impia fallacum hominum*) previously applied by Ovid to Theseus' ungrateful behaviour towards Ariadne; cf. *Her.* 10.99–100 (*Ariadna Theseo*), *viveret Androgeos utinam, nec* ***facta*** *luisses /* ***impia*** *funeribus, Cecropi terra, tuis*. On *impietas*, cf. Lygd. 4.59 (comm.).

43a vos ego nunc moneo: Lygdamus now adopts the role of *magister amoris*, as the disillusioned lover who has learned his lesson and has great experience to draw upon. The erotodidactic tone is reflected in the influence of the *Ars* of Ovid: *quicumque dolore alterius disces posse cavere tuo* is an echo of Ov. *Ars* 3.455, *discite ab alterius vestris timuisse querelis*.

For the formulation *ego vos moneo*, cf. Juv. 6.628–629, *vos ego, pupilli, moneo, quibus amplior est res, / custodite animas, et nulli credite mensae*.

nunc: return to the present, after the legendary past, and the real but distant past of Catullus, introduced by *quondam* (l. 39).

moneo: for *monere* and its derivatives in erotodidactic contexts, cf. eg Tib. 1.6.89; 2.4.51; Prop. 1.1.35, 37; 15.41; 20.1, 51; Ov. *Am.* 1.4.59; 8.21; 2.19.34; *Ars* 1.387, 459, 739; 2.427, 428, 509, 548; 3.48, 353, 494, 750; *Rem.* 124, 128, 136, 296, 439, 804. As for the scansion, the final *-ō* is virtually the norm among the elegists (cf. Lygd. 4.49 *dico* [comm.]).

43b–44: Lygdamus' exhortation to his friends to learn from the misfortunes of others is formulated as a *makarismós* (*beatus qui*, *felix qui*, *fortunatus qui*); on the *makarismós* in literature, see Lygd. 3.26 *felicem*

terque quaterque (comm.). The idea contained in the exhortation is strikingly similar to Ov. *Ars* 3.455, *discedite ab alterius vestris timuisse querelis*; cf. also Ter. *Heaut.* 209–210, *hoc scitumst, periclum ex aliis facere tibi quod es usu siet*; *Rhet. Her.* 4.9, *ii qui sciunt, quid aliis acciderit. facilis est aliorum eventu, suis rationibus possunt providere.* As regards the transmitted text, there are divergences regarding the end of the pentameter between the mss. (*carere tuo*) and the *Fragmentum Cuiacianum* (*cavere tuos*). The preferences of the editors are also divided. The reading *cavere tuo* is a dubious possibility, in that prior to Apuleius there is only evidence for the structure *cavere* + ablative (dative?) in Plautus and Petr. *Satyr.* 82.4, and always, with the exception of Pl. *Rud.* 828, *cave . . . infortunio*, in the formula *malo cavere* (cf. *ThLL* 3.633.10 ff.). It therefore belongs to colloquial language. The choice of *cavere* therefore depends on the alteration of the possessive into *tuum* (< *tuom*); for the normal structure of *cavere* with the accusative, cf. *ThLL* 3.631.39 ff. In favour of the other equally possible expression, *carere tuo*, is that *carere dolore* ("to be free from suffering") is fairly frequent, at least in prose; cf. Cic. *Phil.* 10.20; *Fin.* 2.10; Sen. *Ep.* 66.45; Plin. *Nat.* 28.1; *ThLL* 3.449.60–61; for *carere rebus incommodis* in general, cf. *ThLL* 3.449.34 ff. Nevertheless, the sense of the phrase—the emphasis being on learning from others' misfortune—favours *cavere tuum.*

43 dolore: on the elegiac sense of the term, see the commentary on Lygd 2.3 *dolorem.*

44 alterius: for its use instead of *alii*, and the scansion, see the commentary on Lygd. 4.58 *alterius/*.

disces: impersonal 2nd person.

45–50: the *signa et officia amoris* of women are always false and should should be lent no credit.

45 pendentia bracchia collo/: for the Ovidian 'iunctura' *bracchia collo* at the end of the line, cf. Ov. *Her.* 16(*Paris Helenae*).167, *dumque tuo possem circumdare bracchia collo*; *Met.* 1.762, *dixit et implicuit materno bracchia collo/*; 3.389, *ut iniceret sperato bracchia collo/*; 9.459, *sua fraterno circumdet bracchia collo/*; 605, *circumdare bracchia collo/*; *Tr.* 3.5.15, *bracchiaque accepi presso pendentia collo/*; cf. also Ov. *Am.* 3.7.7–8, *illa . . . nostro subiecit eburnea collo bracchia/*; *Met.* 3.428–429, *collum / bracchia.* For the Roman practice of throwing one's arms round another's neck in an effusive demonstration of affection and devotion, cf. also Catul. 9.8, *applicans . . . collum*; Verg. *Ge.* 2.523–524, *interea dulces pendent circum oscula nati*; *Aen.* 1.715, *ille ubi complexu Aeneae colloque pependit*; 2.792; Prop. 3.12.22, *pendebit collo Galla pudica tuo* (with Fedeli 404); Ov. *Her.*

2.93, *colloque infusus amantis*; *Met.* 1.485; 762; 6.479, *osculaque et collo circumdata bracchia cernens*; 11.386, *collo . . . infusa mariti*; *Fasti* 2.760, *deque viri collo dulce pependit onus*; Val.-Flac. 1.257; Sen. *Thy.* 523–524, *vos quoque, senum praesidia, tot iuvenes, meo / pendete collo*; Mart. 14.54.1, *si quis plorator collo tibi vernula pendet*; *i.a.*

46: the expression *sordida lingua* points to the *avarae puellae*, who use their typically feminine sweet talking to strip their lovers of their possessions (cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.16.15–16, *cupido / sordidus*; Quint. *Inst.* 5.13.26, *pro sordido parcum . . . dicere licebit*; *OLD sordidus* 8). Some editors claim that this line has been faultily transmitted in that, although the topic of the *luxuria muliebris* plays a significant role in Roman love elegy, especially in Propertius and Tibullus, in the case of Lygdamus, in contrast, if the text is accepted, this would be the only reference to it. This, together with Lygdamus' explicit ruling out of *luxuria* as a trait of Neaera in 1.7, leads them to argue that there has been an error in transmission. Of the emendments proposed, the most widely accepted is *subdola* (Heinsius), rather than *perfida* (Bergk); cf. on the one hand Ov. *Ars* 1.598, *titubet blaeso subdola lingua sono/*; Phaedr. 1.13.1, *verbis subdolis*, and, on the other, Ov. *Am.* 3.11.21 (on Corinna), *turpia quid referam vanae mendacia linguae*; *Her.* 7.67 (Dido to Aeneas), *protinus occurrent falsae periuria linguae*. However, the adjective *sordidus* has a wider sense, being applicable to any shameful, degrading or ignoble action (cf. Cic. *Vat.* 13, *de . . . flagitiis tuis sordidissimis furtis*; Catul. 12.5 (on the thieving of Asinius Marrucinus), *sordida res et invenusta est*; *Phaedr.* 4.21.24, *sordido periurio*; Liv. 1.58.4, *ut in sordido adulterio necata dicatur*; *OLD sordidus* 7). Both senses are present when *sordidus* qualifies the ill-gotten gains of prostitution (cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.10.47–48, *parcite, formosae, pretium pro nocte pacisci: non habet eventus* **sordida praeda** *bonos* [with McKeown 300–301]; Mart. 9.7.4, *sordida . . . aera*). Lygdamus could therefore quite properly have used the adjective *sordidus* ("base, despicable",) with reference to the baseness of one guilty of perjury and treachery. In addition, the word closing the pentameter also presents difficulties: although almost all the mss. read *fide*, the vast majority of the *edd. recc.* after Heyne-Wunderlich opt for the reading *prece*, which Scaliger took from his *Excerpta* and was also present in the *Guelferbytanus*. For my part, I prefer the reading *fide* (= *fidei ius iurando*) of the bulk of the mss., like the *edd. vett.* and some *recc.* (Cartault, Pichard, Ponchont, Tescari, Lenz-Galinsky). For *fide/prece*, cf. Lygd. 4.64 *cum multa . . . prece* (comm.).

blanda . . . fide: "with sweet-sounding promises of fidelity". For

blandus, cf. Lygd. 3.2 (comm.); 4.75 (comm.), though here no doubt with negative connotations ("with feigned, specious promises"). *Fides* here has the sense of "promise, guarantee of faithfulness" present in Verg. *Aen.* 6.458–459, *per sidera iuro, / per superos et si qua fides tellure sub ima est*; Hor. *Od.* 3.24.59–60; Prop. 1.18.18 (with Fedeli 430); cf. Fraenkel, *ThLL* 6.670.20 («fere i. q. promissum, ius iurandum»). *Fides* is one of the key words of the *sermo elegiacus*, the cornerstone of the whole elegiac concept of love (*foedus amoris*); cf. D. Fasciano, "La notion de *fides* dans Catulle et les élégiaques latins", *RCCM* 24 (1982) 15–25; on the notion of *fides* in the Roman world, see the extensive study of G. Freyburger, *Fides. Étude sémantique et religieuse depuis les origines jusqu'à l'époque augustéenne*, Paris: Société d'édition «*Les Belles Lettres*», 1986 (for *fides* as the product of a *ius iurandum*, cf. p. 196).

47–48: it was common practice to swear by something dearly loved or by the gods. The proverbial oath by the eyes has a long tradition in Latin love poetry: it is found in comedy (cf. Pl. *Men.* 1060, *si voltis per oculos iurare*); it appears, again in connection with *perfidia muliebris*, in Prop. 1.15.33 ff., *tam tibi ne viles isti videantur ocelli, / per quos saepe mihi credita perfidia est! / hos tu iurabas, si quid mentita fuisses, / ut tibi suppositis exciderent manibus* (with Fedeli 359); Ov. *Am.* 2.16.43–46, *at mihi te comitem iuraras usque futuram / per me perque oculos, sidera nostra, tuos: verba puellarum, foliis leviora caducis, / irrita, qua visum est, ventus et unda ferunt*; 3.3.9–14, *argutos habuit: radiant ut sidus ocelli, / per quos mentita est perfida saepe mihi. / scilicet aeterno falsum iurare puellis / di quoque concedunt, formaque numen habet / perque suos illam nuper iurasse recordor / perque meos oculos: et doluere mei!* (pointed to as the most likely model: Lygdamus' *fallax* recalls *perfida*, l. 10); 11.48, *perque tuos oculos, qui rapuere meos!*; cf. also [Tib.] 3.11 [= 4.5] 8, *perque tuos oculos per Geniumque rogo*); Phaedr. *App.* 8.11–12, *sic, imperator, oculi extollescant mei, / si vidi aut tetigi.* It was also quite common for women to swear by Juno. The belief that women had Juno as their own patron, just as men had their own Genius (cf. Murgatroyd 227 *ad* Tib. 1.7.49), was widespread in Rome from ancient times, as can be seen from the extensive evidence in literature (cf. [Tib.] 3.12[= 4.6].1, *Natalis Iuno*; 19[= 4.13].15, *hoc tibi sancta tuae Iunonis numina iuro*; Sen. *Ep.* 110.1, *singulis . . . Genium et Iunonem dederunt* [scil. *maiores nostri*]; Plin. *Nat.* 2.16, *cum singuli quoque ex semet ipsis totidem deos faciant Iunones Geniosque adoptando sibi*; Juv. 2.98, *et per Iunonem domini* [scil. *effeminati*] *iurante ministro*) and the inscriptions (cf. *CIL* 5.7237, *Genio Sex. Valeri Severini <et> Iunoni Va<leriae> Potitae uxso<ris> eius*; 11.944; 11.8082, *matronis Iunonibus . . . sacrum*); cf. Latte,

RE 13.1.1648 s.v. *Lucina*; Grimal, *Mitología*, p. 299 s.v. *Juno*; Radke 153 (however, there are also authoritative opinions against; cf. Otto, *RE* 7.1157–1158). Analogously, women used to swear by "their Juno"; cf. Petr. *Satyr.* 25.4, *Iunonem meam iratam habeam, si . . .*; and the feminine form of asseveration *eiuno* transmitted by Char. *GL* 1.198 K.). On the other hand, it is quite unknown for a woman to swear "by her Venus". The formulation *per . . . Iunonem . . . suam perque suam Venerem* might have been suggested by Demophoon's oath by the two goddesses in Ov. *Her.* 2.39–41. It should also be recalled that both deities had already been invoked together by Lygdamus in 3.33–34.

As regards the text, some editors consider *fallax* (l. 47) to be incorrect and incompatible with *nulla fides inerit* (l. 49). Huschke thus proposes *pellax* or *audax*. However, this hypercorrection is the result of wrongly taking *fallax* predicatively, affecting the specific action of *iurare*. Instead, *fallax* should be taken as a nominalized adjective (= *fallax puella*). The idea of "falseness" as applied here simply reflects the misogynist prejudices of the poet. In addition, the *iuravit* of the mss. (l. 47) makes no sense, in view of *inerit* (l. 49). Of the possible emendations, *iurabit* ('aliqui recc.') or *iurarit* (Dousa et Fruterius), the latter seems more correct.

47 etsi: as Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, pp. 88 and 123, observes, compound concessive conjunctions in *-si* are hardly suited to poetic language; *etiamsi* (once in Phaedrus), *tametsi* (twice in Lucretius), *tamenetsi* (once in Ennius, Lucretius and Catullus) are only very rarely attested; *etsi*, though somewhat more frequent, is not particularly common either: only 5 times in the whole of the *Corpus Ovidianum* (*Met.* 3 [2.322; 3.238; 4.317]; *Am.* 3.14.50; *Ars* 3.753); twice in Catullus and Propertius; twice in the whole *Corpus Vergilianum* (*Aen.* 2.583, in the Helen episode which may not be genuine, and 9.44, a late book); 3 times in the *Ciris* (eg 415); never in Hor., Luc., Val.-Flac., Sil.; the present passage is the only instance of *etsi* in the whole *Corpus Tibullianum.* It can therefore be concluded that *etsi* was regarded as a prosaic and colloquial word, "von der höheren Dichtung gemieden" (Hofmann-Szantyr 671); cf. also *ThLL* 5.2.978.34 ff.

per . . . iurarit: *iurare per* (*numina, aliquem, numen meum, sim.*) is the classic formula; cf. eg Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.16; [Verg.] *Cir.* 245 (with Lyne 201); Ov. *Her.* 3.53; 13.157–160; 15.107–108; *Met.* 1.188, *per flumina iuro*; 763; 768–769; 3.638; 5.316; 9.371; *Fasti* 2.841; 3.613; *Tr.* 2.53; *Ponto* 3.3.67–68; Sil. 1.118; 10.436 ff.; Quint. *Inst. praef.* 6; *OLD iuro* 1b. The formula *iurare* + accusative ("swear by") is equally old and

poetic; cf. Cic. *Fam.* 7.12.2, *Iovem lapidem iurare*; Catul. 66.40, *adiuro te tuumque caput* (with Fordyce 334); Verg. *Aen.* 6.324, *iurare . . . numen*; 351, *maria aspera iuro*; 12.816, *adiuro Stygii caput implacabile fontis*; 197, *terram, mare, sidera, iuro*; [Tib.] 4.13[= 3.19].15, *hoc tibi sancta tuae Iunonis numina iuro*; Ov. *Her.* 16.321; *Met.* 2.101, *Stygias iuravimus undas* (with Bömer 266); Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik* II[2] 1,264; 2,633; *OLD iuro* 1b (*tr.*). For the formula *iurare in* + accusative in the sense of "to swear by" (not "swear for, against"), though rare in poetry, cf. Hor. *Epod.* 15.4, *in verba iurabas meas*; *Ep.* 1.1.14, *iurare in verba magistri*; Ov. *Ars* 1.687, *iurabant omnes in laesi verba mariti*; *Her.* 10.117; never in Verg., Tib., Prop. (cf. the political formula *in nomen, in verba Caesaris*; eg August. *Gest.* 5.3–4, *iuravit in mea verba tota Italia*); *OLD iuro* 5a.

per . . . suos . . . ocellos: for the frequent tmesis of *per* in oaths, see Lygd. 1.15–16 (comm.).

ocellos: this and *libellum* (1.9 and 17) are the only diminutives used by Lygdamus in the whole of the cycle. Diminutives belong to intimate and familiar registers, and they are therefore very rare in epic style, more frequent in lyric and satire. Catullus and Lucretius make substantial use of these forms, which are, however, relatively rare in Augustan poetry, with an appreciable difference in their frequency between epic and elegy: in the *Aeneid*, Virgil only uses 3 diminutives (once each); Ovid in the *Metamorphoses* only 4, used on 14 occasions; Propertius, on the other hand, has 15 diminutives (used a total of 50 times); the *Corp. Tib.* 9 (12); Ovid in the *Amores* 6 (33); *Ars* 13 (34); *Fasti* 10 (18); the case of Horace is significant: in the *Odes* he only uses 3 diminutives, 5 times in all; the *Epistulae* and *Satirae* together contain some 80 instances. The relative frequency of diminutives in elegy is at times due to their emotional connotations (*sermo amatorius*), with elegy used as a vehicle of expression for personal erotic feelings (eg *ocellus, labellum, lectulus, auricula, vocula*); at other times it is because they are terms describing everyday objects (*sermo cotidianus*), which are more likely to be found in this genre than in epic (eg *corolla, palliolum, quasillum, reticulum, sigillum*). On this question, see Fordyce 95–96 *ad* Catul. 3.18; 286 *ad* Catul. 64.60; Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter*, pp. 38–45; A. Ernout, "Unpoetische Wörter", *RPh* 21 (1947) 67–69; Watson, *Axelson revisited*, pp. 445–447; on diminutives in the Augustan period, cf. A. S. F. Gow, *CQ* 26 (1932) 150–157; Austin 104 *ad* Verg. *Aen.* 4.328. Nevertheless, diminutives are less frequent in elegy than might be expected, especially in comparison with their extensive use in satire and epigram: "the obvious solution here is

that elegy, being less elevated than epic but on a far higher plane than satire/epigram, will use sentimental diminutives, but relatively sparingly" (Watson, *art. cit.*, p. 447). As for *ocellus*, an important word in the *sermo amatorius*, it appears 18 times in Prop.; in the *Corp. Tib.*, only here; in Ov.: *Am.* 11; *Ars* 3; *Fasti* 1; always in an erotic context.

49a nulla fides inerit: the same hexameter-beginning with the same meaning is found in Manil. 4.577, /*nulla fides inerit natis.*

fides: for the elegiac sense of the term, cf. Lygd. 4.64 (comm.).

inerit: scil. *puellis*. For the statistics for *inesse*, cf. Lygd. 4.84 (comm.).

49b–50: the gods turn a deaf ear to oaths of love. For this well-known commonplace of erotic literature, see Hes. *ap.* Apollod. 2.5, διό φεσιν Ἡσίοδος οὐκ ἐπισπᾶσθαι . . . καὶ τὸ ἐπιορκεῖν συγγνώμην ὅρκους ὑπὲρ ἔρωτος; Pl. *Phlb.* p. 65 c, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡδοναῖς ταῖς περὶ τ' ἀφροδίσια . . . καὶ τὸ ἐπιορκεῖν συγγνώμην εἴληφε παρὰ θεῶν; *AP* 5.6.3–4 (Call.), Ὤμοσεν, ἀλλὰ λέγουσιν ἀληθέα τοὺς ἐν ἔρωτι / ὅρκους μὴ δύνειν οὔατ' ἐς ἀθανάτων; Catul. 70; Tib. 1.4.21–26; 9.1–6; Prop. 2.16.47–56; 28.5–8; Ov. *Am.* 1.8.85–86; 2.1.19–20; 3.3.11; *Ars* 1.631–632. On the topic of the *sacramentum amoris* or Ἀφροδισιος ὅρκος, read A. Skiadas, "Periuria amantum. Zur Geschichte und Interpretation eines Motivs des augustischen Liebesdichtung", in *Monumentum Chiloniense*, Fetschrift für E. Burck (Amsterdam 1975) 400–418; A. Ramírez de Verger, "*Sacramentum amoris* en Tibulo", *Homenaje al Profesor J. M. Blázquez* (in press); F. Navarro, "*Iuravi stulte*: [Tib.] 3.19 (= 4.13)", *Actas del VIII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos* (Madrid, 23–28 Septiembre 1991), Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas 1994, pp. 799–804. The formulation of the distich from the penthemimer on corresponds to Ov. *Ars* 1.631–632, *Iuppiter ex alto periuria ridet amantum / et iubet Aeolios irrita ferre Notos.* Note the presence of the same lexical elements in the two authors (*Iuppiter*, *iubet*, *irrita*, *ferre*); the 2nd hemistich of the pentameter, with the topos of the "winds carrying something off", is parallel to Lygd. 4.96, *et iubeat tepidos irrita ferre Notos* (comm.).

periuria: cf. Lygd. 6.39 *periuria linguae* (comm.).

51–52: further rhetorical appeal and rejection of sadness.

51 ergo quid: for the poetic use and scansion of the particle *ergo*, cf. Lygd. 2.9 (comm.). For *ergo* introducing a question, generally an indignant or rhetorical one, cf. *ThLL* 5.2.769 ff.; Ovidian examples in McKeown 80 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.4.3–4; for the formula *quid ergo*, frequently used (eg by Cicero) to introduce a question asked by a real or fictitious interlocutor, see *ThLL* 5.2.764.82–83; Howell 130 *ad* Mart.

1.10.4; Friedlaender 436 *ad* Mart. 6.12.2. P. Laurens, "Martial et l'épigramme grecque du Ier siècle après J.-C.", *REL* 43 (1965) 315–341, compares this use of *quid ergo?* with that of τί γάρ; (cf. eg *AP* 11.155.3–4 [Lucill.]).

fallacis iura puellae: the traditional reading *verba*, maintained by almost all the editors, seems extremely repetitive after its previous appearance in ll. 36 and 38, and its reappearance in only the next pentameter (l. 52). For many authors (eg Tränkle 168) this is a clear symptom of Lygdamus' limited artistic ability. But why not consider the possibility of an error on the part of the copyist, since the *verba* in the next line could easily have caught his eye? Reasoning along these lines, J. H. Voss proposed *vota*; the *codex Caesaraugustanus* reads *dicta*, which in my view is better, since *vota* are promises made to the gods; for *dicta* in the sense of *promissa*, cf. Lygd. 4.78 (comm.). However, I feel it is even more correct to restore *iura*, as the close similarity between the abbreviations for *iura* (ıūa) and *verba* (ūa) would make it easy for the eye to skip downwards, and thus explain the confusion; cf. A. Capelli, *Dizionario di abbreviature latine ed italiane*, Milano: Ulrico Hoepli Editore, 1979, pp. 193 (*iura*) and 385 (*verba*). For the *iura puellae* seen as domination or tyranny on the part of the beloved, cf. Prop. 1.9.1–3, *dicebam tibi venturos, irrisor, amores / nec tibi perpetuo libera verba fore: ecce iaces supplexque venis ad* ***iura puellae*** */ et tibi nunc quaevis imperat empta modo*; 3.11.1–2; 3.20.15; Ov. *Am.* 2.17.24; Pichon, p. 178. This is an example of the legal terminology which the elegists regularly apply to their free love relationship in order to endow it with the seriousness of a *foedus*; on the *foedus amoris*, cf. G. Freyburger, "Le *foedus* d'amour", in *L'élégie romaine* (A. Thill, ed.), Paris 1980, pp. 105–116; bibliography *ad* ll. 49b–50.

52 ite a me, seria verba, procul: since Broukhusius ('e Pocchi excerpta et italicis Heinsii') some editors have preferred to close the pentameter with *procul* instead of the traditional *precor*; the change seems quite correct and perfectly in accordance with the numerous exhortations to joy and the rejection of seriousness with which the text is peppered; for the repudiation formula, cf. Lygd. 4.3 (comm.); on this sympotic topos, cf. 6.7 (comm.); 25.

seria verba: for the phrase, cf. Hor. *Poet.* 105–107, *tristia maestum / voltum verba decent, iratum plena minarum / ludentem lasciva, severum* **seria** *dictu*; it is the counterpoint to the *ebria verba* of l. 36 and a variant on the *tristia verba* of l. 38.

53–56: in sharp contrast with the preceding lines, Lygdamus reaffirms

his love and passion for Neaera, for all her infidelity.

53–54: the distich is clearly lascivious in content. *Requiescere* (or *quiescere*), like all the verbs in the semantic field of "lying, resting, sleeping" (*cubare* and compounds of—*cumbere*; *i.a.*) often has a euphemistic sexual double meaning, acquired no doubt by a kind of brachylogy, as happens in other languages, where expressions of the type "to go to bed (with someone), to sleep with someone" can, in certain contexts, clearly imply love-making; cf. Montero Cartelle, *Latín erótico*, pp. 140–146, especially p. 145 n. 13. (*Re*)*quiescere* with an erotic connotation is only attested in elegy; cf. Prop. 1.8.33; Ov. *Am.* 1.5.25; *Her.* 5.13; Tib. 1.1.43 (cf. *cubantem et dominam*..., ll. 45–46); Pichon, p. 249. *Longas* . . . *noctes* are the long nights of winter (*noctes hiemales*), which are ideal for love (cf. Catul. 68.83, [*hiems*] ***noctibus in longis*** *avidum saturasset amorem*); for the comforting image of lying with one's beloved while harsh winter rages outside, cf. Tib. 1.1.43–48 (with echoes like *requiescere* and *quam iuvat*). The erotic sense of *pervigilare* and *pervigilium*—equally euphemistic and the result of brachylogy ("to spend the night awake <making love>")—is well attested (cf. Catul. 88.2). However, the expression *longos pervigilare dies* is striking, as it is the only known occurrence of this verb in connection with daytime (it is usually applied to night). This use can be explained in the light of examples like the passage of Catullus cited, where the verb *pervigilare* is used without reference to night. In this case it might be concluded that if *longas* . . . *noctes* is a reference to the long winter nights, *longos* . . . *dies* could well refer to the long days of summer, with *pervigilare* therefore alluding to the idea of not sleeping the summer siesta, with its corresponding sexual implications. For lustful siestas, cf. Catul. 32; Ov. *Am.* 1.5.1 ff. However, the adjective *longus* applied to time with the meaning of "interminable" is quite ambiguous because of the subjective shades of meaning it implies: Lygdamus here may be suggesting both that he wishes the days and nights he dreams of spending with Neaera to be long, and also that he would like to spend in Neaera's company the days and nights which at present seem endless without her. It is in fact a commonplace for the nights to seem interminable to the *exclusus vel pervigilans amator*, cf. *AP* 5.189.1, νὺξ μακρὴ καὶ χεῖμα (Asclep.); Hor. *Od.* 1.25.7–8, *me tuo longas pereunte noctes, / Lydia, dormis?* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 295); *Ep.* 1.1.20–21, *ut nox longa quibus mentitur amica, diesque / longa videtur opus debentibus*; Prop. 1.12.13–14, *nunc primum longas solus cognoscere noctes / cogor* (with Fedeli 295); Ov. *Am.* 1.2.3, *et vacuus somno noctem, quam longa, peregi* (with McKeown

35); 2.19.21–22, *sine me ante tuos proiectum in limine postes / longa pruinosa frigora nocte pati*; *Her.* 1.9, *spatiosam . . . noctem*; 12.60, *acta est per lacrimas nox mihi quanta fuit*; 16(15).317, *sola iaces vacuo tam longa nocte cubili*; [Verg.] *Priap.* 47.5, *ipse longa nocte dormiat solus*. The generic motif of the νὺξ μακρά for those suffering from anguish is found in Apollod. *Com. Att. Frg.* 3 p. 289 Koch (*frg.* 3), τοῖς γὰρ μεριμνῶσιν τε καὶ λυπουμένοις / ἅπασα νὺξ ἔοικε φαίνεσθαι μακρά.

The traditional reading *tecum longas* (l. 53) seems preferable to the inverse *longas tecum* followed by some editors from the *editio Aldina* of 1515, as it respects the parallelism with the following pentameter (*tecum longos*, l. 54).

Here, once again, some authors have detected a hidden allusion to neoteric principles: «The absence of sleep, one of several symptoms denoting love, was given a new poetic significance by Callimachus who took it as a mark of polished literary production (cf. Call. *Epigr.* 27.3–4). The literary metaphor was adopted by Latin poets (cf. Cinna, *fr.* 11.1–2 Morel) along with its erotic connotations, and in neoteric poetry ἀγρυπνία designates the inseparable blend of poetic creation and amatory sensations (cf. Catul. 50; Prop. 1.10.1–10)» (M. Parca, "The Position of Lygdamus in Augustan Poetry", *Stud. in Lat. Lit. and Rom. Hist.* 4 [Bruxelles 1986] 473).

53 requiescere noctes/: for the expression, cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 1.79, *hic tamen hanc mecum poteras requiescere noctem/*.

55: the text as it has come down to us can only mean: "treacherous and unjustly hostile to me, one who has deserved well of her". The pleonasm in the formulation can be tolerated in Lygdamus, but not the lack of agreement in *nobis . . . merenti* (instead of *nobis merentibus*), which is characteristic of archaic Latin and the lower linguistic strata (cf. Ter. *Eun.* 649, *absente nobis*; *Rhet. Her.* 4.16, *praesente multis*; Catul. 107.5–6, *insperanti . . . / nobis*; *i.a.*). The only acceptable emendation is to read *nec amica* (for *inimica*), following some *recentiores* and the *editio Veneta* of 1475, as some editors have done since Heyne (Baehrens, Luck, Tränkle): *mihi inmerito perfida, alteri non merenti amica*. That Neaera has struck up a relationship with another man is clear from l. 60. Note the double antithesis *mihi/alteri*, *perfida/amica*.

perfida nec: for the postponing of *nec*, see Lygd. 4.91 (comm.) and 6.19 (comm.).

nec merito . . . nec . . . merenti: a double litotes (combined with polyptoton), ie *immerito . . . immerenti*.

merito . . . merenti: polyptoton; for this special type of paro-

nomasia, cf. Lausberg, *Retórica literaria*, pp. 118–123 (§§ 640–648).

nec . . . merenti: ie *non bene de te merenti.*

56: the formulation of this line recalls Lygd. 1.6, *seu mea, seu fallor, cara Neaera tamen.* Similarly contradictory feelings are placed in the mouth of Dido by Ovid (*Her.* 7.27–30):

Ille quidem male gratus et ad mea munera surdus
et quo, si non sim multa, carere velim.
Non tamen Aenean, quamvis male cogitat, odi,
sed queror infidum questaque peius amo.

quamvis perfida: *quamvis* with an adjective is found in Cic. *Nat.* 2.1; Caes. *Gall.* 4.2.5; Sall. *Cat.* 23.6; cf. Bömer 567 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 3.494 *quamvis irata* (with the superlative from Val.-Max. 8.15 praef.); with a participle from Prop. 1.15.13, although it is more a feature of post-Augustan Latin (in prose from Val.-Max. 2.7.12); cf. Barratt 265 *ad* Luc. *Civ.* 5.811 *quamvis . . . urente*; E. B. Lease, *AJPh* 21 [1900] 453; Kühner-Stegmann II.2.445; Hofmann-Szantyr 385 (§ 206 *Zus.* ß) and 604 (§ 326), together with F. Bömer, *Gymnasium* 73 (1966) 333. For *quamvis* as a conjunction, see Lygd. 6.29 (comm.).

tamen/: on the infrequent appearance of adverbs at the end of the pentameter in the elegists, see Lygd. 1.6 *tamen/* (comm.). The fact that *tamen* is the only adverb in Lygdamus in this position in the line reinforces the idea that there is here a conscious and deliberate echoing of 1.6, rather than simple coincidence of structure.

57–58: following this dramatic sentimental relapse, Lygdamus attempts to justify his attitude by arguing that even Bacchus fell in love. The naiad is the water nymph, and this consequently prompts Lygdamus to order the slave to mix the wine (= Bacchus) with water (= Naiad). Adding water to the wine thus signifies that, for the time being, amorous nostalgia is triumphing over the desire to forget Neaera (unmixed wine, l. 62). The Romans usually drank their wine mixed with tepid water; cf. Verg. *Ge.* 1.9; Mayor 255 *ad* Juv. 5.63. Those who drank their wine neat were, in fact, the object of criticism; cf. [Verg.] *Catal.* 11.1–2; Mart. 1.11.3–4. However, according to W. Younger (*Gods, Men and Wine* [1966] 205) the imbibing of unmixed wine was probably not infrequent in Rome, and more common than in Greece.

57 Naida Bacchus amat: the retinue of Dionysus included naiads, as is sporadically attested in poetry from Pratin. *Fr.* 1.4 Page; cf.

Hor. *Od.* 3.25.14–15, *o Naiadum potens Baccharumque*; *Orph. H.* 64.6 (of Silenus), Ναίσι χαὶ Βάκχαις ἡγούμενε. However, the fact that the wine-god here is referred to as having been in love with a water-nymph simply gives the poet an opportunity, by means of a playful metonymic periphrasis, as observed by Tränkle 169, to state that "the best thing is to drink wine watered-down". Meleager had composed an aetiological epigram (*AP* 9.331) explaining the reason why Greeks mixed wine with water, and why neat wine was regarded as fiery: when Semele was killed by Zeus' thunderbolt, he rescued the unborn Dionysus, her son, and sewed him into one of his thighs, where he remained for three months. The child was born in the midst of a fire caused by another thunderbolt; and the naiad Dirce, symbol of the water of the springs and daughter of the river Achelous, picked him up as he rolled about in the flames and washed him, thus saving his life. A combination of the two liquids therefore seals the friendship between them and avoids the perils of neat wine:

> Αἱ Νύμφαι τὸν Βακχον, ὅτι ἐκ πυρὸς ἥλαθ' ὁ κοῦρος,
> νίφαν ὑπὲρ τέφρης ἄρτι κυλιόμενον.
> Τοὔνεκα σὺν Νύμφαις Βρόμιος φίλιος· ἢ δέ νιν εἴργῃς
> μίσγεσθαι, δέξῃ πῦρ ἔτι καιόμενον.

Cf. *AP* 11.49.3 (Even.), χαίρει κιρνάμενος δὲ τρισὶν Νύμφαισι τέταρτος (= 2.3 D.) Common examples of mythological metonymy referring to water are: a) the Achelous, a river in Calydon (Aetolia), the first river to appear when the world was created; cf. eg E. *Ba.* 625; *Andr.* 1267; Call. *Epigr.* 29; Verg. *Ge.* 1.9, *poculaque inventis Acheloia miscuit uvis* (with Mynors 4–5); Ov. *Fasti* 5.343 (with Bömer 312); b) *nympha*, in the sense of *lympha*. This latter procedure has been analysed by Haupt *Opuscula* II 169 n. 1 and Wackernagel *Kleine Schriften* II (Göttingen 1955–79) 1226. This form of metonymy was already known in Greek poetry (cf. Even., *AP* 11.49.3 = 2.3 D., *sup. cit.*); the practice became more frequent in Hellenistic poetry (cf. *AP* 9.258.2 [Antiphan.]), from which it passed, via the metonymic image of Catul. 61.28–30 (*Aonios specus, / Nympha quos super irrigat / frigerans Aganippe*) into Latin poetry (cf. Lucr. 6.1178; Hor. *Od.* 3.13.15; [Verg.] *Dir.* 67, *flectite currentis nymphas vaga flumina retro*; Prop. 3.16.4, *cadit in patulos nympha Aniena lacus* (with Fedeli 498–499); 3.22.26; [Albinov.] *Obit.* 33; Mart. 6.43.2, *cana . . . sulphureis nympha natatur aquis*; 47.1; Stat. *Silv.* 1.3.37, *emissas per cuncta cubilia nymphas*; and 46; 2.2.20 (with Van Dam 205); 3.3.101, *calidas . . . nymphas* (with Laguna 162); *ThLL* 7.76 ff., *OLD nympha* 1b. On mythological metonymy, cf. Lausberg,

Retórica Literaria II, pp. 71–72 (§ 568); Gross, *De metonymiis sermonis Latini a deorum nominibus petitis*, Diss. Halens. XIX 4 (1911); for *Bacchus* = *vinum*, cf. Lygd. 2.19 *annoso . . . Lyaeo* (comm.); 6.5, *generoso . . . Baccho*; 17–18, *Bacchi / munera* (comm.).

Naida: the Nymphs, young and beautiful female divinities of a lower rank who lived in the mountains, woods, rivers, springs and the countryside in general, comprise a number of different groups and categories: the Meliae, or "Nymphs of the ash tree", born, like the Gigantes, from the blood of Uranus; the Dryades or Hamadryades, "Nymphs of the oak" or else of trees in general, whose life was connected with a particular tree; the Naiads or fresh-water nymphs, especially those of brooks and springs; the Oreades or nymphs of the mountains; the Alseides, or nymphs of the woods; the Antriades or cave nymphs; and the several thousand Oceanides, who like the rivers in general were daughters of Oceanus and Thetis, are also sometimes called nymphs. Apart from the Meliae and the daughters of particular rivers, the other nymphs either have no genealogy or are considered daughters of Zeus, or else, like the rivers themselves, of Oceanus (which is particularly the case with the Naiads); cf. Heichelheim, *RE* 17.1532 ff.; Grimal, *Mitología*, pp. 372–373 s.v. *Náyades*, pp. 380–381 s.v. *Ninfas*; Ruiz de Elvira 195 (n. 13) *ad* Ov. *Met.* 1.192; Bömer 48 *ad* Ov. *Fasti* 1.405 *Naides.*

Bacchus amat: for this poetic phrase to indicate what wine can be combined with or goes well with, cf. Ov. *Fasti* 5.345, *Bacchus amat flores*; Mart. 4.82.6, *sed sua cum medius proelia Bacchus amat*; cf. also Ov. *Her.* 15.25, *Gnosida Bacchus amavit*; for the opposite expression, cf. Lygd. 6.38, *odit Lenaeus*. For this peculiar use of *amare*, cf. Catul. 62.16, *amat victoria curam*; Ov. *Am.* 2.16.41, *ulmus amat vitem*; *Rem.* 143, *Venus otia amat*; *ThLL* 1.1955.58 ff.

57 cessas, o lente minister?: Lygdamus rebukes the servant, telling him to hurry and refill the cups. A similar use of *cessas* as a formula to press someone into action is found in Enn. *Scen.* 213 (= Fest. p. 324.28 Th.), *procede, gradum proferre pedum, / nitere, cessas, o fide?* (cf. Vahlen, *Opuscula* I, pp. 118–119); Verg. *Aen.* 6.51–52, *"cessas in vota precesque, / Tros", ait* (scil. *Sybilla*), *"Aenea? cessas? . . . "*; but for the context of a symposium see especially Mart. 9.93.1, *addere quid cessas, puer, immortale Falernum?*; for the formula *quid cessas?* see Tarrant 211 *ad* Sen. *Ag.* 198. For the order to the servant in question-form to hurry up and serve wine, cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.11.18–20, *quis puer ocius / restinguet ardentis Falerni / pocula praetereunte lympha?* (with Nisbet-Hubbard

176 on instructions to slaves phrased in interrogative and/or indefinite form); Mart. 11.36.5–6, *Hypne, quid expectas, piger? inmortale Falernum / funde* (note, with Kay 150, the appropriate name of this *piger puer*). For the expression *cessas . . . lente*, cf. Ov. *Her.* 6.17, *quid queror officium lenti cessasse mariti?*

lente: ie *piger*, *tardus*. On the ambivalent meaning of this adjective, cf. Lygd. 5.30 (comm.).

minister: for the poetic use of the term to refer to the servant-cupbearer at a dinner-party, cf. Catul. 27.1, *minister vetuli puer Falerni*; Verg. *Aen.* 1.705–706, *totidemque pares aetate ministri / qui dapibus mensas onerent et pocula ponant*; Val-Flac. 5.694, *Phrygius . . . minister* (scil. *Ganymede*); Juv. 5.63, *quando rogatus adest calidae gelidaeque minister?*; Mart. 1.11.3; 10.98.1, *addat cum mihi Caecubum minister*, 11.11.3; Stat. *Silv.* 1.6.31–34 (describing imperial slaves) *hi panaria candidasque mappas / subvectant epulasque lautiores; / illi marcida vina largiuntur: / Idaeos totidem putes ministros.* For the semantic and stylistic differences between *famulus-a* (more elevated, and preferred by writers of epic and tragedy), *servus-ancilla* (a favourite in lyric and elegy, not found in epic and tragedy) and *minister-tra* (more neutral), cf. Watson, *Axelson revisited*, pp. 434–436.

58: the expression *Marcia lympha* refers to the water brought to Rome by the monumental aqueduct built in 144–140 BC by *Q. Marcius Rex* and consequently known as *Aqua Marcia*, later restored by Vipsanius Agrippa in 33 BC (Plin. *Nat.* 36.121). The Romans considered this water to be the purest and coldest (cf. Plin. *Nat.* 31.41, *clarissima aquarum omnium in toto orbe, frigoris salubritatisque palma praeconio Vrbis, Marcia est, inter reliqua deum munera Vrbi tributa*; Frontin. *Aqu.* 91.5). On its coolness, cf. also Stat. *Silv.* 1.5.26–27, *frigora ducens / Marcia.* This aqueduct supplied the north-west part of Rome, and its *castellum* (distribution tank) can still be seen just inside the *Porta Collina*, in the northern corner of the Baths of Diocletian, whose huge cistern in fact fed a special branch of this old aqueduct. On the *Aqua Marcia*, see Frontin. *Aqu.* 7; 67; Kay 262 *ad* Mart. 11.96.1; Th. Ashby, *Aqueducts of Ancient Rome* (1935) 88 ff.; S. B. Platner-Th. Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, Roma 1965, pp. 24–27; E. Nash, *A Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome* I (1968[2]) 48 ff.; H. B. Evans, *Water Distribution in Ancient Rome*, Michigan 1994; *OCD* s.v. 'Aqueducts' (p. 89).

Similar formulations to *Marcia lympha* can be found in Propertius (3.2.14, *Marcius . . . liquor*, 22.24, *Marcius umor*). The phrase *annosum . . . merum* also appears in Ov. *Ars* 2.418, at the same place in the line (cf. also Lygd. 2.19, *annoso . . . Lyaeo* [comm.]).

temperet: "to prepare a combination of different elements in the right proportions"; cf. *OLD tempero* 6; Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford 1957) 344. Normally the agent mixed in is water, but cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.21.11 (with Nisbet-Hubbard 252), where Horace seeks to emphasize the smoothness of some first-class wines (see, for a more common expression, Sil. 7.169, *pocula nec norant sucis mulcere Lyaei*).

59–64: final triumph of the joyful party spirit. Lygdamus solemnly declares that he will not spend the night sighing for Neaera, if she would rather be with another man than attend the banquet. He forthwith orders neat wine to be served and proceeds to apply perfume to himself and place the garland on his head.

59: there are problems with the transmission of the verb of this line (*fugit/fugiat*). The subjunctive form is correct, as it stresses the element of hypothesis in the protasis ("though a fickle girl reject . . ., I will not spend the night sighing".

convivia mensae: the same phrase at the end of a line in Ov. *Met.* 1.165; 12.222 (here acc. + nom.); *Ib.* 431; Laus. Pis. 13.5; Mart. 8.39.1; *ThLL* 8.739.71–74. For the poetic use of *convivia* ("banquet", "party", "celebration"), cf. also Catul. 47.5; Verg. *Ge.* 1.301; Ov. *Am.* 3.1.17, *vinosa . . . convivia*; Mart. 2.41.16; *ThLL* 8.739.53 ff.

non ego: for this frequent beginning to a line, characteristic of the *aversio*, cf. Lygd. 2.5 (comm.); 5.7–14 (comm.).

60 ignotum . . . torum: this striking phrase is only found in [Tib.] 3.16[= 4.10].6, *ne cedam ignoto . . . toro.* There are diverse opinions on what exactly Lygdamus means by *ignotum.* Some commentators believe it is equivalent to *alienum* ("unknown, new"), others *obscurum* ("of low social status"). The former seems more apposite: by *ignotum torum* the poet refers to a "new bed", that is, a new lover, as opposed to *notum torum*, "the familiar, habitual bed", that is, Lygdamus (just as *notae . . . dominae* in [Tib.] 3.19.22 is a reference to the "familiar mistress"). The predominantly poetic term *torus* in the elegists often implies, like *lectus*, sexual relations (cf. Tib. 1.8.62; [Tib.] 3.19.1; *i.a.*). For the metonymic use of *torus*, "bed of love", to denote the lover, in addition to [Tib.] 3.16.6 *sup. cit.*, cf. Ov. *Her.* 8.25–26, *nec turpe marito / aspera pro caro bella tulisse toro* (here conjugal love). This use of the term no doubt originates in the expression *torus genialis* or marriage bed (= "marriage"; cf. Ov. *Met.* 7.91; *Fasti* 4.602; *Tr.* 2.346, *vetitos sollicitare toros*; Luc. *Civ.* 2.329; Mart. 10.47.10; 10.71.5); from this it goes on to denote the conjugal relationship itself, and finally, with the elegists, in their desire to attach to their free love relationship the

attributes of marriage, *torus* can even refer to any kind of amorous relationship or sexual union.

vana puella: ie *levis*, *inconstans*, *mendax*.

61 sollicitus: in elegy the adjective denotes the lover who is worried and restless in the face of any eventuality that might have a negative effect on his relationship, in the present case a possible rival. Thus the *sollicitus Amor* of Ovid (cf. *Her.* 1.12; 18[17].196; *Rem.* 557). See Lygd. 6.36 *sollicitis* (comm.).

repetam . . . suspiria: poetic periphrasis for *suspirare*. The expression *suspiria repetere* ("to breathe sighs, to sigh deeply") is only found in Ovid; cf. *Met.* 2.125, *repetens suspiria dixit* (with Bömer 272–273); 13.739, *talibus adloquitur repetens* (*referens* recc.) *suspiria dictis*. The noun is never attested in Verg., Hor., Tib.; in Ov. 8 times (*Am.* 2.19.55; *Met.* 7: 1.656; 2.125; 753; 774; 9.539; 10.402; 13.739) and Prop. 3 (1.3.27; 2.22B.47; 3.8A.27), always in the plural. In most cases *suspiria* is accompanied by the verbs *ducere* (eg Prop. 1.3.27; Ov. *Met.* 1.656–657; 2.774; 10.402–403, *suspiria duxit ab imo / pectore*; Stat. *Siv.* 3.5.2, *anxia pervigili ducis suspiria cura*; Mart. 11.39.9) or *trahere* (eg Ov. *Met.* 2.753). For the poetic use of *repetere* in the sense of "repeat (actions or words)", cf. Lucr. 4.791, *repetunt . . . gestum*; Verg. Aen. 3.436; [Verg.] *Dir.* 14; Hor. *Poet.* 365; Ov. *Her.* 5.51, *oscula dimissae quotiens repetita dedisti!*; *Met.* 12.578, *repetito munere Bacchi*.

suspiria: sighing reveals the suffering of love (*signum amoris*); cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 4.72, (*amor*) *si quis est . . ., sine desiderio, sine cura, sine suspirio*. On sighs betraying the unhappiness of a lover at a banquet, cf. also Hor. *Epod.* 11.8–10, *conviviorum et paenitet / in quis amantem languor et silentium / arguit et latere petitus imo spiritus*. For the *suspiria amoris* as a sign of the disturbed sleep of hapless lovers, cf. Prop. 2.22B.47, *quanta illum toto versant suspiria lecto!*; 3.8.27, *odi ego quos numquam pungunt suspiria somnos* (with Fedeli 295); Ov. *Am.* 2.19.55, *nil metuam? per nulla traham suspiria somnos?*; cf. also Prop. 1.3.27–30 and Stat. *Silv.* 3.5.2 (with Laguna 348–349), where the sighs of Cynthia and Claudia respectively in sleep are interpreted by Propertius, and ruled out by Statius, as signs of infidelity. As a *signum amoris* in general, revealing the lover's suffering, cf. also Tib. 1.6.35, *absentes alios suspirat amores*; [Tib.] 3.11.11, *quodsi forte alios iam nunc suspiret amores*; Ov. *Ars* 3.675–676, *spectet amabilius iuvenem et suspiret ab imo / femina*; *Met.* 9.537 (where the *suspiria* are expressly cited as an *index* alongside other *signa amoris*); 10.402–403, *Myrrha "patre" audito suspiria duxit ab imo / pectore*; Mart. 1.106.7, *suspiras, retices, gemis: negavit* (scil. *amasia*); 10.14(13).9 (*exclusus*

amator), *nec miserum cessant suspiria pectus*; cf. Pichon, p. 272.

tota . . . nocte: "all night". In classical Latin, duration of time is properly expressed by the so-called 'accusative of extent in time'. However, even in the classical period the ablative also begins to be used for this purpose (from Catul. 109.5 *tota . . . vita* [with Fordyce 397], Varro *Rust.* 2.2.16, *toto die cursantes*, and Caes. *Gall.* 1.26.5, *ea tota nocte continentur ierunt*), a usage which becomes general in the post-classical period, in some authors (eg Livy, Ovid) even gaining preponderance over the accusative (eg Prop. 1.6.7, *totis argutat noctibus ignis*). This temporal use of the ablative was facilitated by the presence of the adjective *totus*, which stresses duration. On this use of the ablative and its subsequent development, cf. Löfstedt, *Per. Aeth.* 52 ff.; Kühner-Stegmann 2.1.284 and 360, Anm. 12; Hofmann-Szantyr 41 (§ 46 b) and 148 (§ 87 *Zus.* d); Ernout-Thomas 31 (§ 40); Bassols I.52–53 (§ 39–40) and 149–150 (§ 134).

62: third apostrophe of Lygdamus to cupbearer-sclave (cf. ll. 5–6 and 57), this time pressing him to serve neat wine. This line presents some difficulties with regard to the opening words. The traditional *tu puer et* makes no sense. To replace it, the editors are divided between those who accept the reading of the *Fragmentum Cuiacianum* (*tu puer i*) and the followers of the conjecture by Ach. Statius, *i puer et*, accepted by Huschke (and later by Luck). In favour of the latter is the fact that the *i* reinforcing an imperative in a formula of exhortation (≈ *age*) is generally linked with it by means of a conjunction (*atque*, *et*, *-que*) and is usually positioned at the beginning of the utterance (cf. Ter. *Hec.* 787, *i atque exple eis, coge, ut credant*; Prop. 3.23.23–24, *i puer et citus haec aliqua propone columna, / et dominum Esquiliis scribe habitare tuum*; 2.29A.22, *i nunc et noctes disce manere doni!*; Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.92, *i, puer, atque meo citus haec subscribere libello*; Mart. 10.12.7, *i precor et totos avida cute conbibe soles*; *ThLL* 5.2 631.58 ff.); Lygdamus himself uses this formula with a conjuntion elsewhere (cf. 1.17; 4.3). However, the tradition favours *tu, puer, i.* There are also examples in which the linking conjunction is missing (cf. Hor. *Ep.* 1.7.71, *nunc i, rem strenuus auge*; *ThLL* 5.2 631.62–79), or where the word-order is reversed, that is, the imperative *i* (or *ite*) is placed after the imperative it is reinforcing (eg Pl. *Bacch.* 497, *cura, ei, concastiga hominem probe*; *Truc.* 583; Sen. *Oed.* 1051; Sil. 7.101; 11.214–215, *rapite ite citati signa*; 16.86; *ThLL* 5.2 632.24–28). Moreover, the omission of *et* underlines the idea of urgency, and asyndeton is a feature of short, energetic expressions. Also with a possible bearing on the lack of linking conjunction is the

reproach or mockery formula *i* [*nunc*] + imperative ("come now, . . .", "come on, . . ."), which is generally asyndetic; for this ironic use, frequent from Virgil on, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.381 (Dido to Aeneas), *i, sequere Italiam ventis!*; 7.425, *i nunc, ingratis offer te inrise periclis* (with Pease 325–326); Prop. 3.18.17, *i nunc, tolle animos et tecum finge triumphos*; McKeown 183 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.7.35 (with numerous *loci Ovidiani*); Bömer 157 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 12.475–476 (with *loci*); Howell 113 *ad* Mart. 1.3.12 and 201 *ad* Mart. 1.42.6; Kay 145–146 *ad* Mart. 11.33.3, *i nunc, livor edax, dic . . .* (cf. also Mart. 10.96.13, *i, cole nunc reges*); E. B. Lease, "*I nunc* and *I* with another imperative", *AJPh* 19 (1898) 59–69, who notes that "this formula does not seem to appear in prose until the time of Seneca . . . *i nunc* belongs almost exclusively to the realms of poetry" (p. 60); Hofmann-Szantyr 837 (§ 58 h); H. Dahlmann, "Die Hendekasyllaben des Sentius Augurinus", *Gymnasium* 87 (1980) 175–176 and n. 13 (with *loci*); for its colloquial use, cf. Hofmann, *Latín familiar*, p. 58 and n. 2 (§ 47); *ThLL* 5.2.632.37–56. However, there is no lack of examples of this ironic formula with a linking conjunction (cf. Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.76, *i nunc et versus tecum meditare canoros*). For the emphatic presence of *tu*, cf. Pl. *Cas.* 587, *i tu atque arcesse illam.* As regards the content, for neat wine making the unhappy lover forget his woes, cf. *AP* 12.50.5 (Asclep.) and *AP* 12.49 (Mel.); cf. also Tib. 1.2.1–4.

puer: ὦ παῖ. For the apostrophe to the *puer*, in addition to Prop. 3.23.23–24 (with Fedeli 670) and Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.92, cf. W. Abel, *Die Anredeformen bei den römischen Elegikern*, diss. (Berlin 1930) 94. Cf. also the commentary on Lygd. 5.5 (*care puer*).

liquidum . . . merum: the same phrase is found in Ov. *Tr.* 2.490; Mart. 12.60.8 (*ThLL* 7.2.1484.27–28; cf. also Hor. *Ep.* 1.14.34, *liquidi . . . Falerni*). *Liquidus* (= *mundus*, *purus*) here is an *epitheton ornans*, as when it accompanies *aqua.* In combination with *vinum* it is not very frequent in classical poetry, which can be explained either on metrical grounds or by its use as a solemn term in sacrificial language; for other parallel expressions, cf. also Pl. *St.* 700, *nimio liquido Libero*; Verg. *Ge.* 4.384, *liquido nectare*; *Aen.* 5.238, *vina liquentia fundam*; Ov. *Met.* 7.246, *liquidi carchesia vini* (with Bömer 267); 13.639, *liquido . . . Baccho*; Col. *Rust.* 12.28.3, *curandum est, ut cum diffundis* (scil. *vinum*) *liquidum et sine faece diffundas*; 38.4; Macr. *Sat.* 7.12.7; *ThLL* 7.2.1484.22–28.

fortius: here it should be taken as more of an adverb (= *magis fortiter*, "more strongly"), equivalent in force to *magis* (*fortius adde*

= "add more"); this force is first attested in Ovid; cf. Ov. *Met.* 2.127, *fortius utere loris* (with Bömer 273, who cites Ov. *Ponto* 3.1.72; *Met.* 6.708 and *Fasti* 5.614, although he describes this testimony as «nicht ganz undeutig»); *ThLL* 6.1164.73 ff.; U. Staffhorst, *P. Ovidius Naso, Epistulae ex Ponto III.1–3*, Diss. Würzburg (1965) 37. For his part, Némethy (p. 86) prefers to take it as an adverb, but with more of a qualitative force: *maiore cum sedulitate, diligentius* (cf. l. 67, *lente minister*); for *fortiter* = *sedulo*, cf. Tib. 2.3.5–6, *o ego, cum aspicerem dominam, quam fortiter illic / versarem valido pingue bidente solum.* Some editors and commentators (Scaliger, Huschke, Heyne, etc.) prefer to interpret *fortius* as an adjective equivalent to the Gr. ζωρότερον ("neat, unmixed"; cf. Hom. *Il.* 9.202), while for the application of two adjectives to the same noun (*liquidum fortius . . . merum*) they cite Lygd. 5.22, *dura . . . tertia regna.*

adde merum: the same expression is found in Tib. 1.2.1, and at the end of a line in Ov. *Am.* 1.4.52 (cf. *ThLL* 8.849.3). For *adde* as a standard formula to order the servant to serve wine, cf. also Mart. 9.93.1; 10.98.1; 14.170.2, *decies adde Falerna, puer.*

63–64: on the basic significance of this distich, cf. Ov. *Fasti* 5.341, *nulla coronata peraguntur seria fronte / nec liquidae vinctis flore bibuntur aquae* (with Bömer 313–314).

The festive practice of perfuming the hair (with myrrh, saffron, nard, etc.) and bedecking it with flowers (myrtle, roses, water-parsley, lilies, etc.) is constantly mentioned in descriptions of banquets, especially in Horace; cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.36.15–16; 2.7.7–8, *coronatus nitentis / malobathro Syrio capillos*, and 21–25, *oblivioso levia Massico / ciboria exple, funde capacibus / unguenta de conchis. Quis udo / deproperare apio coronas / curatve myrto*; 3.29.3–4; for the content of the hexameter, cf. also Hor. *Od.* 2.11.13 ff., *cur non . . ., dum licet, Assyria . . . nardo potamus uncti?.* Sweet-smelling garlands are also mentioned by Mart. 3.65.8, *quod madidas nardo passa corona comas: / hoc tua, saeve puer Diadumene, basia fragrant.* On the significance and uses (sympotic, ritual, funerary, etc.) of the garland in Greek and Latin Antiquity, cf. Daremberg-Saglio s.v. *corona* (Émile Egger-Eug. Fournier); C. Soria, "El παρακλαυσίθυρον como presupuesto cultural de la elegía latina", *EClás* 1944, p. 34 n. 51; R. Mª Marina Sáez, "El elemento simposíaco in la elegía latina", *Actas del VIII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*, Madrid 1994, pp. 729–731. For flowers in banquets, cf. Hor. *Od.* 1.36.15–16, *neu desint epulis rosae / neu vivax apium neu breve lilium* (with Nisbet-Hubbard 405–406). One of most common plants at symposia was

myrtle, as it was believed to dispel the fumes of wine (cf. Nisbet-Hubbard *Od.* I 425). For the syntax of the distich ("long ago should I have . . ."), cf. Juv. 3.163, *debueram olim tenues migrasse Quirites.*

63 Syrio . . . nardo: for the phrase and for the ms. corruption into *Tyrio*, cf. Hor. *Od.* 2.7.8; 11.16; Lygd. 4.28, *Syrio . . . rore* (n.). For the practice of perfuming the hair, cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.1.7, *venit odoratos Elegia nexa capillos*; *Fasti* 5.340 (on a κῶμος), *habent unctae mollia serta comae*; Nisbet-Hubbard 66 *ad* Hor. *Od.* 1.4.9; Lilja, *Odours*, p. 82 ff. Perfume is an essential element in the symposium, and is mentioned in archaic Greek poetry (cf. Alc. *fr.* 362 L.-P.; Sapph. *fr.* 94.18–28 L.-P.) as well as in Hellenistic (*AP* 5.199.3–6 [Hedyl.]). It was commonly used in Rome (according to Plin. *Nat.* 12.84, the Romans spent 100 million sesterces a year on scents) and, according to J. Griffin ("Augustan Poetry and the life of luxury", *JRS* 66 [1976] 93), the presence of perfume in poetry is simply a reflection of the luxury of Roman society, although it should not be forgotten that it was already a sign of wealth in Greek lyric (cf. Sapph. *fr.* 96.18–29 L.-P.). Besides, it is featured relatively rarely in Roman elegy in comparison with the lyrical works of Horace, albeit in Lygd. 4.28 there is a mention of Syrian nard, and in Prop. 3.10.22, of two perfumes present in Hellenistic poetry: saffron (*AP* 5.200 [Anon.]; 7.218 [Antip. Sid.]) and myrrh (cf. *AP* 5.200 [Anon.]; 12.123 [Antip. Sid.]); cf. Marina Sáez, *art. cit.*, p. 731.

madefactus tempora nardo: for the Latin construction of the perfect participle passive with the accusative of respect, and the usual metrical position of *tempora* (5th foot), cf. Lygd. 4.23 (comm.).

madefactus: deliberately ambiguous, since *madefactus*, apart from referring to the perfume, has a double sympotic sense here ("soaked" > "drunk"); cf. Ov. *Ars* 3.765, *mulier multo madefacta Lyaeo*; Col. *Rust.* 10.309, *multo madefactus Iaccho*; Mart. 11.15.5, *vino madeat*; Apul. *Met.* 10.21; Cels. 1.3.14. There is a similar ambiguity with the adjective *madidus*; cf. McKeown 143 *ad* Ov. *Am.* 1.6.38. The verb *madere* and its derivatives are frequently used 'de capillis' (*ThLL* 8.33.12 ff.; 56 ff.; 34.18–19; 36.72 ff.); strictly, *madidus* is used with the ablative, from Cic. *Quint. frg.* 2.10.4; frequently so in Ovid (cf. Bömer 291 *ad* Ov. *Met.* 2.198); sometimes even without the need for an ablative *ungento* or similar (eg Verg. *Aen.* 4.216, *crinem . . . madentem* [= "perfumed hair"]; Ov. *Am.* 1.6.38, *madidis lapsa corona comis*).

tempora nardo/: the same combination closes the hexameter in Tib. 2.2.7, *illius puro destillent tempora nardo/.*

64 debueram . . . implicuisse: "(long ago) . . . should I have entwined . . .". Note the use of the periphrastic expression of obligation *debeo* + infinitive instead of the periphrastic passive voice.

For the poetic device of the use of the perfect infinitive *metri causa* in place of present infinitive, cf. Lygd. 3.1 *implesse* (comm.). Some idea of the convenience of this form in dactylic rhythm, especially, as here, in the 2nd hemistich of the pentameter, can be gathered from the fact that «su un totale di 92 inf. pf. attivi in Tibullo, ben 64 occupano, nel pentametro, il primo piede (talora esclusa l'arsi) e le prime due sillabe del secondo piede del secondo emistichio (¦[-]uu/-uu: *e.g.*, 1.1.30: *aut stimulo tardos* ¦ *īncrĕpŭīssĕ boves*; 1.3.18: *Saturnive sacram* ¦ *me tĕnŭīssĕ diem*); in 14 casi l'inf. pf. attive si trova, nell'essametro, tra la cesura eftemimere (quasi sempre secundaria) e il 5° trocheo (¦uu/-u: *e.g.*, 1.1.29: *Nec tamen interdum pudeat* ¦*tĕnŭīssĕ bidentem*)» (P. A. Perotti, "L'infinito perfetto in Tibullo e nel *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Orpheus* 10 [1989] 148–149).

In addition, the use of the verb *debeo* to express the nuance of obligation in place of the periphrastic passive (cf. *ThLL* 5.93.53 ff.) is not very poetic, although there are some examples among the Augustan elegists, especially Ovid; cf. Tib. 2.1.7, *debent . . . coronato stare boves capite*; Prop. 3.6.5, *debet sine vano nuntius esse*; Ov. *Am.* 1.14.38, *ut placeas, debes immemor esse tui*; 2.3.4, *vulnera quae fecit, debuit ipse pati*; *Her.* 3.44, *quae dare debueras, accipere . . . negas*; *Ars* 1.724, *debet nauta . . . esse niger*; *Met.* 4.195, (*Sol*) *qui . . . omnia cernere debes*; 9.590–591, *notare / debueram*; *Fasti* 4.406, *perpetuit debuit illa tegi*; *Ibis* 644, (*pede*) *quo debent bella geri*; *Ponto* 4.10.76, *vir tanto, quanto debuit ore cani*; in particular, for the structure *debeo* (in the past) with perfect infinitive, cf. Ov. *Her.* 12.4, (*tunc Parcae*) *debuerant fusos evoluisse meos*; *Rem.* 112, (*Philoctetes*) *certa debuerat praesecuisse manu*; 574 (*Pari, funera fratrum*) *debueras oculis substituisse tuis*; *Met.* 6.700, *hac ope debueram thalamos petiisse*; *Fasti* 1.354, *palmite debueras abstinuisse, caper*; *ThLL* 5.94.30–40.

sertis implicuisse comas: crowning the head with a garland was a prominent practice in the Greek symposium; cf. eg Alc. 41; 362.1–2 L.-P.; Anacr. 51; 65; 89; 160d P.; Hor. *Od.* 1.36.15–16, *neu desint epulis rosae / neu vivax apium neu breve lilium*; Lilja, *Odours*, pp. 85–86; P. von der Müll, "Il simposio greco", in M. Vetta (ed.), J. Trumpf (transl.), *Poesia e simposio nella Grecia Antica: guida storica e critica*, Roma-Bari 1983, p. 87; Marina Sáez, *art. cit.*, pp. 729–731. The expression *sertis implicuisse comas* is particularly close to Ov. *Her.* 9.94, *Cerberus implicitis angue minante comis*. The closest examples of the use of *implicare*

("encircle") in connection with the hair come from Virgil; cf. *Aen.* 4.148, *fluentem fronde premit crinem fingens atque implicat auro*; 7.136, *frondenti tempora ramo implicat*; cf. also Ov. *Fasti* 5.220, *serta . . . caelestes implicitura comas*; for this perfect infinitive of *implico*, cf. Smith 279–280 *ad* Tib. 1.4.56. For the ablative *sertis*, cf. Ch. E. Bennett, "The Ablative of Association", *TAPhA* 36 (1905) 69–70 s.v. *implico.* The dative with this verb is extremely rare and not attested before Virgil (cf. *Aen.* 2.724, *dextrae se parvus implicuit*).

comas: on the terms for "hair" in Roman poetry, see the commentary on Lygd. 1.10 *comas.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *CORPVS TIBVLLIANVM*: EDITIONS AND COMMENTARIES

Ach. Stativs: Achilles Stativs, *Tibullus cum commentario*, Venetiis: A. Manutius 1567 (= *editio Aldina III*).

Ayrmann, Ch. F.: *Albii Tibulli equitis Romani poetarumque elegiacorum principis Vita poematum eius enarrationi temporumque, quibus ille vixit, ac Messalae inprimis vitae rerumque gestarum illustrationi inserviens*, Vitebergae 1719.

Bach: E. C. Chr. Bach, Berlin, 1819.

Baehrens: E. Baehrens, *Albii Tibulli elegiarum carmina libri II. Accedunt Pseudotibulliana*, Leipzig, 1878, XXVI–88 pp. (reviewed by Rossberg, *NJb* 1879, 71–79).

Bauzá: H. F. Bauzá, *Albio Tibulo. Elegías*, Madrid: CSIC 1990 (reviewed by J. L. Arcaz Pozo, *Habis* 22 [1991] 444–447).

Bolle: L. Bolle, *De Lygdami carminibus*, Neustettin 1875.

Brovkhvsivs: J. van Broekhuyzen, *Albii Tibulli equitis Rom. quae exstant, ad fidem veterum membranarum sedulo castigata. Accedunt Notae, cum variar. Lectionum Libello, et terni Indices; quorum primus Omnes Voces Tibullianas complectitur*, Amstelaedami: officina Wetsteniana, 1708.

Calonghi: F. Calonghi, *Albii Tibulli aliorumque carminum libri IV*, Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum, Torino 1928.

Cartault: A. Cartault, *Tibulle et les auteurs du Corpus Tibullianum*, Paris: Armand Colin 1909 (reviewed by de Gubernatis, *BFC* 15 [1909] 275–277; Jacoby *BPhW* 26 [1909] 1460–1472; Butler, *CR* [1910] 124–126; Dubois, *RPh* 1911, 308; Belling, *WKPh* 1909, 1166–1176; Vollmer, *DLZ* 30 [1909] 2720–2721; de la Ville de Mirmont, *RU* 19, 1, 459; Bürger, *Bursian*, 153,120; *LZB* 62, 1248).

Cyllenivs: *Editio Veneta a. 1500 cum commentario Bernardini Cyllenii Veronensis edita ab Hieronimo Avantio apud Ioannem Iacuinum.*

Damsté: P. H. Damsté, "Ad Lygdami elegias", *Mnemosyne* 36 (1908) 205–210.

Della Corte: F. Della Corte, *Tibullo. Le Elegie*, Fondazione Lorenzo Valla 1989² (= 1980).

Dissen: L. Dissen, *Albii Tibulli Carmina ex recensione Car. Lachmanni passim mutata*, Gottingae: Libraria Dieterichiana 1835.

De Golbéry: Ph. A. de Golbéry, *Albii Tibulli quae supersunt opera omnia varietate lectionum, novis commentariis, excursibus, imitationibus Gallicis, vita auctoris et indice absolutissimo*, Parisiis 1826.

Heyne-Wunderlich: Chr. Gottl. Heyne, *Albius Tibullus, Carmina libri tres cum libro quarto Sulpiciae et aliorum* (with notes and comments by E. C. F. Wunderlich [1817] and supplement by L. Dissen [1819]), Lipsiae 1817–1819 (repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms 1975).

Hiller: E. Hiller, *Albii Tibulli Elegiae cum carminibus pseudotibullianis*, Lipsiae 1885 (repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms 1965).

Huschke: J. G. Huschke, Leipzig 1819.

Lachmann: C. Lachmann, ed. cum adnot. crit., Berolini, 1829.

Lee: G. Lee, *Tibullus: Elegies* (with introduction, text, translation and notes), Leeds: F. Cairns, 1990³.

Lenz: F. W. Lenz, *Albii Tibulli Aliorumque Carminum libri tres*, Leiden: Brill, 1959 (reviewed by Bardon, *REL* 37[1959] 358; Le Bonniec, *Latomus* 18 [1959] 808–809; Eisenhut, *DLZ* 81 [1960] 629–634; Leon, *CW* 53 [1960] 194; Enk, *Mnemosyne* 14 [1961] 179–182; Sciuto, *Orpheus* 8 [1961] 117; Verdière, *RSC* 12 [1964] 353–354.

Lenz: F. W. Lenz, *Albii Tibulli aliorumque carminum libri tres, ed. alt. emend. add. auct.*,

Leiden: Brill 1964 (reviewed by VERDIÈRE, *RSC* 12 [1964] 353–354; JOCELYN, *Gnomon* 38 [1966] 35–40; PRÉAUX, *Latomus* 25 [1966] 588–589; DELLA CASA, *Maia* 20 [1968] 80–81).

LENZ-GALINSKY: F. W. LENZ ET G. K. GALINSKY, *Albii Tibulli aliorumque carminum libri tres*, Leiden: Brill 1971 (cf. G. K. GALINSKY, "Some Emendations and Non-Emendations in the third Edition of the *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Mnemosyne* 26 [1973] 160–169, and reviews by G. LUCK, *AJPh* 95 [1974] 300–301; E. N. O'NEIL, *CPh* 69–70 (1974–1975) 133–138; E. J. KENNEY, *CR* 25 [1975] 32–33).

LEVY: F. W. LEVY (= LENZ), *Albii Tibulli aliorumque carminum libri tres*, Leipzig 1927 (reviewed by ULLMAN, *CPh* 1928, 299–301; CASTIGLIONI, *BFC* 34, 155–156; CALONGHI, *RF* 1927, 529–536; FUNAIOLI, *RIGI* 1927, 161–162; HELM, *PhW* 1927, 1387–1392.

LUCK: G. LUCK, *Albii Tibulli Aliorumque Carmina*, Stutgardiae: Teubner 1988 (cf. reviews by H. TRÄNKLE, *MH* 45 [1988] 258–259; J. L. BUTRICA, *CR* 39 [1989] 211–212; F. NAVARRO, *Habis* 22 [1991] 447–450); A. RAMÍREZ DE VERGER. *Emerita* 60 [1992] 155–157).

MÜLLER: L. MÜLLER, *Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii carmina. Accedunt Laevii Calvi Cinnae aliorum reliquiae et Priapea*, Lipsiae: Teubner 1874.

MURETVS: M. A. MURETVS, *Catullus et in eum Commentarius M. Ant. Mureti. Ab eodem correcti et scholiis illustrati Tibullus et Propertius*, Lugduni: G. Rovillius, 1559.

MURGATROYD: P. MURGATROYD, *Tibullus I. A Commentary on the First Book of the Elegies of Albius Tibullus*, Pietermaritzburg: University of Natai Press 1980 (repr. in Bristol, 1991).

MURGATROYD: P. MURGATROYD, *Tibullus. Elegies II. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

NAMIA: G. NAMIA, *Opere di Albio Tibullo e Sesto Properzio*, Torino: Unione tipograficoeditrice Torinese 1973.

NÉMETHY: G. NÉMETHY, *Lygdami Carmina. Accedit Panegyricus in Messallam*, Budapestini 1906 (reviewed by S. ALLEN, *CR* 20 [1906] 449–456).

PICHARD: L. PICHARD, *Tibulle et les auteurs du Corp. Tib.*, Paris: Librairie ancienne Honoré Champion 1924.

PONCHONT: M. PONCHONT, *Tibulle et les auteurs du Corpus Tibullianum*, Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles-Lettres" 1968 (1926¹). Reviewed by BOISACQ, *RBPh* 1924, 337; ERNOUT, *RC* 1924, 363; GALLETIER, *REA* 1924, 282; MAROUZEAU, *RPh* 1924, 159; MUSTARD, *AJPh* 1925, 374; HINNISDAELS, *BMB* 1925, 181; MAROUZEAU, *REL* 1925, 238; SOUTER, *CR* 1926, 89.

POSTGATE: J. P. POSTGATE, *Tibulli Aliorumque Carminum Libri Tres*, Oxonii 1905 (= 1915²). Reviewed by VASSAREAU, *BC* 1907, 7–11; CONSOLI, *BFC* 13, 64–66; FOSTER, *CPh* 1907, 364; BELLING, *WKPh* 1906, 1145–1153; *CR* 1915, 158; PONCHONT, *RPh* 1923, 165.

PUTNAM: M. C. J. PUTNAM, *Tibullus. A Commentary*, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press 1973.

SMITH: K. F. SMITH, *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus. The Corpus Tibullianum edited with Introduction and Notes on Books I, II, and IV.2–14*, New York: American Book Company, 1913 (reimpr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1985). Reviewed by *Wheeler*, *AJPh* 1913, 461–470; *Tyrrell*, *Ha* 17, 429–433; THOMAS, *RC* 1913, 365–367; RAMORINO, *A & R* 1914, 125; DALMASSO, *BFC* 1914, 40; HELM, *BPhW* 1914, 1574–1581; HELM, *DLZ* 1914, 1569; ENK, *MPh* 1914, 205; VALLETTTE, *REA* 1914, 470; SABBADINI, *RF* 1914; DE LA VILLE DE MIRMONT, *RU* 1914, 2, 158; FRIEDRICH, *WKPh* 1914, 708; JAHN, *DLZ* 1915, 1393; THULIN, *NTF* 4, 83; ULLMAN, *CW* 1914, 212–214.

TESCARI: O. TESCARI, *Tibullo e gli altri poeti del 'Corpus Tibullianum'*, Classici greci e latine XI, Milano: Istituto Editoriale Italiano 1951 (reviewed by Funaioli, *Doxa* 4 [1951] 149–155; Marmorale, *Athenaeum* 30 [1952] 275–276).

TRÄNKLE: H. TRÄNKLE, *Appendix Tibulliana*, Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter 1990 (reviews by J. L. BUTRICA, *CR* 52 [1992] 45–47; F. NAVARRO *Tempus* 6 [1994] 64–81; G. LUCK, *GGA* 246 [1994] 70–86); P. FEDELI, *Gnomon* 67 (1995) 502–507.
DE LA VILLE DE MIRMONT: H. DE LA VILLE DE MIRMONT, *Le poète Lygdamus. Étude critique, suivie d'une éd. et d'une trad. de Élegies*, Paris 1904.
VOSS: J. H. VOSS, *Tibull und Lygdamus nach den Handschriften berichtiget, mit Anmerk. P. BURMANNS und den Konjeturen SCHRADERS*, Heidelberg 1811.
VVLPIVS: I. A. VULPIVS, *Albius Tibullus, eques Romanus, et in eum Io. Antoniii Vulpii philologi ac rhetoris in gymnasio pataviano novus commentarius diligentissimus*, Patavii a. 1749.

1.2. *CORPVS TIBULLIANVM*: TRANSLATIONS

ARCAZ POZO, J. L.: *Tibulo. Elegías*, Madrid, 1994.
BAUZÁ, H. Fco.: *Tibulo. Elegías*, Madrid 1990.
DELLA CORTE, F.: *Tibullo. Le elegie*, Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, 1980.
HERRERA ZAPIEN, T.: *Tibulo. Elegías*, México, 1975.
LA PENNA, A.: *Albio Tibullo e gli autori del Corpus Tibullianum. Elegie*, Milano, 1989.
LEE, G.: *Tibullus, Elegies*, Francis Cairns 1990³.
LENZ, F. W.: *Tibull. Gedichte*, Stuttgart 1966.
OTÓN SOBRINO, E.: *Tibulo. Poemos*, Barcelona, 1973.
Ponchont: vid. Editions.
SANMILLÁN, C. M.: *Tibulo. Elegías I*, Granada, 1973.
SOLER RUIZ, A.: *Catulo, Poemas, Tibulo, Elegías*, Madrid, 1993.
TESCARI, O.: *Tibullo. Elegie*, Milano, 1951.
VITALI, G.: *Tibullo. Elegie, Bolovia, 1940.*

2. EDITIONS, COMMENTARIES AND TRANSLATIONS OF CLASSICAL AUTHORS USED

ANTHOLOGIA GRAECA: A. S. F. GOW and D. L. PAGE, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, 2 vols., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

A. S. F. GOW and D. L. PAGE, *The Greek Anthology. The Garland of Philip and some Contemporary Epigrams*, 2. vols., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

W. R. PATON, *The Greek Anthology*, 5 vols., London-Cambridge: Loeb Classical Library, 1960–1970.

ANTHOLOGIA LATINA: F. BUECHELER, *Anthologia Latina. Pars II Carmina Latina Epigraphica, fasc. I–II*, Stuttgart: Teubner, 1895, 1897, 1930.

E. LOMMATZSCH, *Anthologia Latina. Pars II, fasc. III Supplementum*, Stuttgart: Teubner, 1982 (= 1926).

SHACKLETON BAILEY, R. D., *Anthologia Latina. Pars I Carmina in codicibus scripta, fasc. 1 Libri Salmasiani aliorumque carmina*, Stuttgart: Teubner, 1982.

CALLIMACHVS: A. S. HOLLIS, *Callimachus Hecale*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

CATVLLVS: P. FEDELI, *Catullus' Carmen 61*, Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1983.

C. J. FORDYCE, *Catullus*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.

CICERO: A. S. PEASE, *M. Tulli Ciceronis de divinatione libri duo*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1973 (= *University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature* 6 [1920] 161–500 y 8 [1923] 153–474).

ENNIVS: O. SKUTSCH, *The Annals of Q. Ennius*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

I. VAHLEN, *Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae*, Leipzig: Teubner, 1903.

FRAGMENTA POETARVM LATINORVM: C. BÜCHNER, *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum*, Leipzig: Teubner, 1982.

HORATIVS: A. KIESSLING and R. HEINZE, *Q. Horatius Flaccus Oden und Epoden*, Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1917.

R. G. M. NISBET and M. HUBBARD, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book I*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.

R. G. M. NISBET and M. HUBBARD, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book II*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

G. WILLIAMS, *The Third Book of Horace's Odes*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.

JVVENALIS: E. COURTNEY, *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, London: The Athlone Press, 1980.

J. E. B. MAYOR, *Juvenal, Thirteen Satires with Commentary*[4], 1888–1889.

LVCANVS: P. BARRATT, *M. Annaei Lucani Belli Civili Liber V. A Commentary*, Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1979.

LVCRETIVS: E. J. KENNEY, *De Rerum Natura. Book III*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.

MANILIVS: A. E. HOUSMAN, *Manilii Astronomicon*, Londinii: Grant Richards, 1903.

MARTIALIS: M. CITRONI, *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Liber Primus*, Florence, 1975.

P. HOWELL, *A Commentary on Book One of the Epigrams of Martial*, London: The Athlone Press, 1980.

N. M. KAY, *Martial. Book XI: a Commentary*, London: Duckworth, 1985.

W. M. LINDSAY, *M. Val. Martialis Epigrammata*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903 (1929[2]).

OVIDIVS: J. BARSBY, *Ovid. Amores I*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973 (= Bristol: Bristol University Press, 1979).

F. BÖMER, *Metamorphoseon*, 4 vols., Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätverlag, 1969–1977.

P. BRANDT, *P. Ovidii Nasonis de Arte Amatoria Libri Tres*, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1991 (= Leipzig: Dietrichschen Verlags-Buchhandlung, 1902).

V. CRISTÓBAL LÓPEZ, *Amores. Arte de amar. Sobre la cosmética del rostro femenino. Remedios contra el amor*, Madrid: Gredos, 1989.

M. HELZLE, *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Epistularum ex Ponto liber IV*, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1989.

A. S. HOLLIS, *Ovid. Ars Amatoria Book I*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

G. LUCK, *P. Ovidius Naso. Tristia* (vol. I: edition and translation; vol. II: commentary), Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätverlag, 1967–1977.

J. C. MCKEOWN, *Ovid: Amores. Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in four volumes. Volume I: Text and Prolegomena*, Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1987.

J. C. MCKEOWN, *Ovid: Amores. Text, Prolegomena and Commentary in four volumes. Volume II: A Commentary on Book One*, Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1989.

S. G. OWEN, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Tristium Libri Quinque Ibis ex Ponto Libri Quattuor Halieutica Fragmenta*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915.

A. PÉREZ VEGA, *Cartas desde el Ponto. Libro II*, Sevilla: Editorial Universidad de Sevilla, 1989.

P. Pinotti, *Remedia Amoris*, Bologna: Patron Editorice, 1988.

A. Ramírez de Verger and F. Socas, *Publio Ovidio Nasón. Obra amatoria I: Amores*, Madrid: C.S.I.C., 1991.

A. Ruiz de Elvira, *P. Ovidio Nasón. Metamorfosis*, 3 vols., Barcelona: Alma Mater, 1964.

Persivs:

M. Dolç, *A. Persio Flaco. Sátiras*, Barcelona: Publicaciones de la Escuela de Filología de Barcelona, 1949.

R. A. Harvey, *A Commentary on Persius*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981.

O. Jahn, *Aulii Persii Flacci Satirarum Liber cum scholiis antiquis*, Lipsiae 1843 (repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1967).

W. Kibel, *Aules Persius Flaccus. Satiren. Herausgegeben, übersetzt und Kommentiert*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1990.

Poetae Latini Minores:

A. Baehrens, *Poetae Latini Minores*, Lipsiae: Teubner, 1898.

Propertivs:

P. J. Enk, *Commentarius criticus*, Leiden: Brill, 1962 (= 1946).

P. Fedeli, *Il Primo Libro delle Elegie*, Firenze: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 1980.

P. Fedeli, *Il Libro Terzo delle Elegie*, Bari: Adriatica Editrice, 1985.

P. Fedeli, *Properzio. Elegie. Libro IV*, Bari: Adriatica Editrice, 1965.

G. P. Goold, *Propertius. Elegies*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990.

A. Ramírez de Verger, *Propercio. Elegías*, Madrid: Biblioteca Clásica Gredos, 1989.

Seneca:

C. D. N. Costa, *Seneca. Medea*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

M. Coffey and R. Mayer, *Seneca. Phaedra*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

R. J. Tarrant, *Seneca. Agamemnon*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

O. Zwierlein, *L. Annaei Senecae. Tragoediae. Incertorum Auctorum Hercules [Oetaeus] Octavia*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Stativs:

K. M. Coleman: *Statius. Silvae IV*, Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1988.

M. Dewar, *Statius. Thebaid IX*, Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1991.

H. W. Fortgens, *P. Papinii Statii de Opheltis funere carmen epicum. Thebaidos Liber VI 1–295*, Zutphen: Nauta & Co., 1934.

A. Imhof, *P. Papinii Statii Ecloga ad Uxorem*, Halis: Typys Orphanotrophei, 1863.

H. Heuvel, *Publii Papinii Statii Thebaidos Liber Primus*, Zutphen: Nauta & Co., 1932.

D. H. Hill, *P. Papini Stati Thebaidos Libri XII*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1983.

G. LAGUNA, *Estacio, Silvas III. Introducción, edición crítica, traducción y comentario*, Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 1992.

A. MARASTONI, *P. Papini Stati. Silvae*, Leipzig: Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1970.

H. M. Mulder, *Publii Papinii Statii Liber secundus commentario exegetico aestheticoque instructus*, Diss. Groningen, 1954.

H. SNIJDER, *P. Papinius Statius Thebaid. A Commentary on Book III*, Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1968.

H.-J. VAN DAM, *P. Papinius Statius, Silvae Book II: A Commentary*, Leiden, 1984.

R. D. WILLIAMS, *P. Papini Stati. Thebaidos Liber Decimus*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.

VERGILIVS: R. G. AUSTIN, *P. Vergili Maronis. Aeneidos Liber Quartus*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

R. G. AUSTIN, *P. Vergili Maronis. Aeneidos Liber Sextus*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

P. T. EDEN, *A Commentary on Virgil: Aeneid VIII*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975.

R. A. B. MYNORS, *Virgil. Georgics*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

E. NORDEN, *P. Vergilius Maro, Aeneis Buch VI*, Leipzig 1926³ (= Berlin 1916).

A. S. PEASE, *Vergilius Maro, Publius. Aeneidos liber quartus*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1967.

R. F. THOMAS, *Virgil. Georgics*, 2 vols., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

R. D. WILLIAMS, *Virgil. Aeneid V*, Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1960.

[VERGILIVS]: F. R. D. GOODYEAR, *Aetna*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

R. O. A. M. LYNE, *Ciris*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

3. STUDIES

The studies most frequently cited in the present work are listed here in alphabetical order by author. Each bibliographical entry is preceded by the corresponding abbreviated title. The abbreviated form is intended to be explicit. The abbreviation for a book appears in italics (eg: MILLER, *Spice Trade* = J. I. MILLER, *The Spice Trade of the Roman Empire (29 B.C. to A.D. 641)*, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1969), while articles are referred to in inverted commas (eg: AXELSON, "Lygd. & Ov." = B. AXELSON, "Lygdamus und Ovid. Zur Methodik der literarischen Prioritätsbestimmung", *Eranos* 58 [1960] 93–11). When various editions of a book are cited, it should be understood that the most recent has been used.

ADAMS, *Lat. sexual vocabulary*: J. N. ADAMS, *The Latin sexual vocabulary*, London: Duckworth; Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982.

AL: *Anthologia Latina*, ed. A. RIESE, 1894.

ALTHEIM, *Terra Mater*: F. ALTHEIM, *Terra Mater*, *RVV* XXII 2, Gießen 1931.

ANDRÉ, *Botanique*: J. ANDRÉ, *Lexique des termes de Botanique en latin*, *Études et Commentaires* 23, Paris: Klincksiek, 1956.

ANDRÉ, *Termes de couleur*: J. ANDRÉ, *Études sur les termes de couleur dans la langue latine*, *Études et Commentaires* 7, Paris: Klincksiek, 1949.

APPEL, *De Roman. precationibus*: G. APPEL, *De Romanorum precationibus*, New York: Arm Press, 1975 (= *RVV* VII, 2. Heft, Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1909).

D'ARMS, *Romans on the Bay of Naples*: J. H. D'ARMS, *Romans on the Bay of Naples: A social and cultural study of the Villas and their Owners from 150 B.C. to A.D. 400*, Cambridge, Massachussets: Harvard Dissertation, 1970.

AXELSON, *Unpoetische Wörter*: B. AXELSON, *Unpoetische Wörter: Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtersprache*, Lund, 1945 (discussion in Williams, *Trad. & Orig.*, pp. 743 ff.; review by A. ERNOUT, *RPh* 21 [1947] 55–70).

AXELSON, "Lygd. & Ov.": B. AXELSON, "Lygdamus und Ovid. Zur Methodik der literarischen Prioritätsbestimmung", *Eranos* 58 (1960) 93–111 (= *Kleine Schriften zur lateinischen Philologie* [Stockholm 1987] 283–297).

AXELSON, "Geburtsjahr": B. AXELSON, "Das Geburtsjahr des Lygdamus. Ein Rätsel der römischen Elegiendichtung", *Eranos* 58 (1960) 281–297 (= *Kleine Schriften zur lateinischen Philologie* [Stockholm 1987] 298–309).

BASSOLS: M. BASSOLS DE CLIMENT, *Sintaxis latina*, 2 vols., Madrid: C.S.I.C. 1956.

BELOCH, *Campaniem*: K.-J. BELOCH, *Campaniem. Geschichte und Topographie des antiken Neapel und seiner Umgebung*, Breslau 1890^2 (repr. Roma 1964) (1879^1).

BIRT, *Buchwessen*: TH. BIRT, *Das antike Buchwessen*, Berlin, 1882.

BIRT, *Kunst*: TH. BIRT, *Die Buchrolle in der Kunst*, 1907.

BIRT, *Abriß*: TH. BIRT, *Abriß des antike Buchwessen*, München, 1913.

BLÜMNER, *Römische Privaltertümer*: H. BLÜMNER, *Die römische Privataltertümer*, München, 1911.

BLÜMNER, *Technologie*: H. BLÜMNER, *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern*, Leipzig: Teubner, 1875–1887.

BRUCHMANN, *Epitheta Deorum*: C. F. H. BRUCHMANN, *Epithta Deorum quae apud poetas Graecos leguntur*, Leipzig 1983 (supplement in ROSCHER, vol. 7).

BÜCHNER, "Lygdamus": K. BÜCHNER, "Die Elegien des Lygdamus", *Hermes* 93 (1965) 65–112, 503–508.

CAIRNS, *Generic Composition*: F. CAIRNS, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman poetry*, Edinburgh: Francis Cairns, 1972.

CARTER, *Epitheta Deorum*: J. B. CARTER, *Epitheta Deorum quae apud poetas Latinos leguntur*, Leipzig 1902 (supplement in ROSCHER, vol. 7).
CIL: *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, Berlin, 1863–.
CLE: F. BÜCHELER, *Carmina Latina Epigraphica*, I–II, Leipzig, 1895–1897 (= Amsterdam 1972); *Supplementum* (= III) by E. LOMMATZSCH, Leipzig 1926 (= Amsterdam 1972).
CUPAIUOLO, *Tra Poesia e Poetica*: F. CUPAIUOLO, *Tra Poesia e Poetica*, Napoli: Libreria Scientifica Editrice, 1966.
CURTIUS: E. R. CURTIUS, *Literatura Europea y Edad Media Latina* (2 vols.), Madrid: Fondo de Cultura Económica (= Berna: A. Francke AG Verlag 1948).
DAREMBERG-SAGLIO: C. DAREMBERG et E. SAGLIO, *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines d'après les textes et les monuments* (5 vols.), Paris, 1877–1919.
ERATH: W. ERATH, *Die Dichtung des Lygdamus*, Diss. Erlangen-Nuremberg 1971 (review by E. J. KENNEY, *CR* 24 [1974] 138).
ERNOUT-THOMAS: A. ERNOUT-F. THOMAS, *Syntaxe Latine*, Paris: Klincksieck 1964^2 (1951^1).
FGrHist: *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (F. JACOBY), 1923 ff.
FLETCHER: G. B. A. FLETCHER, "On Tibullus and other Poets of the *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Latomus* 24 (1965) 45–51.
FONTENROSE I: J. E. FONTENROSE, "Apollo and the Sun-God in Ovid", *AJPh* 61 (1940) 429–444 (summary in *PAPA* 69 [1938] 36–37).
FONTENROSE II: J. E. FONTENROSE, "Apollo and Sol in the Latin Poets of the First Century B.C.", *TAPhA* 70 (1939) 439–455.
FORBES, *Technology*: R. J. FORBES, *Studies in Ancient Technology* (1955–).
FORCELLINI: A. FORCELLINI, *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*, I–VI, Prati: typis Aldinianis, 1858–1875.
FRIEDLÄNDER: L. FRIEDLÄNDER, *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire*, London, 1907–1913 (repr. New York, 1979).
FRISK, *GEW*: H. FRISK, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, I (1960); II (1970).
GIANGRANDE, "Tópicos helen. en elegía": G. GIANGRANDE, "Los tópicos helenísticos de la elegía latina", *Emerita* 42 (1974) 1–36.
GNOLI, *Marmora Romana*: R. GNOLI, *Marmora Romana*, Rome: Edizioni dell'Elefante, 1971.
GRIMAL, *Mitología*: P. GRIMAL, *Diccionario de mitología griega y romana*, Barcelona: Paidos, 1981.
GUIRAND, *Mitología general*: F. GUIRAND, *Mitología general*, Barcelona-Madrid-Buenos Aires-Río de Janeiro-México-Montevideo: Labor 1962 (= Paris: Larousse, 1960).
HINARD: F. HINARD (ed.), *La mort, les morts et l'au-delà dans le monde romain*, Actes du colloque de Caen (20–22 Novembre 1985), Caen: Université de Caen 1987.
HOFMANN, *Latín familiar*: J. B. HOFMANN, *El latín familiar*, trans. and annotated by J. COROMINAS, Madrid: C.S.I.C. 1958 (= *Lateinische Umgangssprache*, Heidelberg 1936^2 [= repr. 1951]).
HOFMANN-SZANTYR: *J. B. Hofmann - A. Szantyr*, *Lateinische Grammatik*, II Band: *Syntax und Stilistik*, München: C. H. Beck, 1965 (review by F. Bömer en *Gymnasium* 73 [1966] 331–334).
ICV: Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres, ed. E. Diehl, 1925 ss.
KÜHNER-STEGMANN: R. KÜHNER and C. STEGMANN, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, rev. by A. THIERFELDER, 2 vols., Leverkusen 1955.
LATTIMORE, *Themes in Epitaphs*: R. LATTIMORE, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, Urbana, 1962 (= *Illinois Studies in Language and Literature* 28, 1948, nos. 1–2).
LAUSBERG, *Retórica literaria*: H. LAUSBERG, *Manual de Retórica literaria*, 3 vol., Madrid: Gredos, 1966 (Spanish trans. of *Handbuchder literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, München: Max Hueber Verlag, 1960).
LEUMANN: M. LEUMANN, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*, München: C. H. Beck, 1963.
LILJA, *Odours*: S. LILJA, *The Treatment of Odours in the Poetry of Antiquity*, 1972.
LÖFSTEDT, *Syntactica*: E. LÖFSTEDT, *Syntactica*, Lund, 1924.

LUCK, *Love Elegy*: G. LUCK, *The Latin Love Elegy*, London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1959 (1969²).
MALTBY, *LALE*: P. MALTBY, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, Leeds: F. Cairns (Publications) Ltd., 1991.
MAROUZEAU, *L'Ordre des Mots*: J. MAROUZEAU, *L'Ordre des Mots dans la Phrase latine* I–III, Paris 1922–1949.
MAROUZEAU, *Stylistique*: J. MAROUZEAU, *Traité de Stylistique latine*, Paris, 1946.
MARQUARDT-MAU: J. MARQUARDT-A. MAU, *Das Privatleben der Römer*, 1886.
MARTIN, *Manuel d'Architecture*: R. MARTIN, *Manuel d'Architecture Grecque, I. Matériaux et techniques*, Paris: Picard 1965.
MILLER, *Spice Trade*: J. I. MILLER, *The Spice Trade of the Roman Empire (29 B.C. to A.D. 641)*, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1969.
MONTERO CARTELLE, *Latín erótico*: E. MONTERO CARTELLE, *Aspectos léxicos y literarios del latín erótico (hasta el s. I d. C.)*, Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago, 1973 (Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 1991²).
NAVARRO, *Amada codiciosa*: F. NAVARRO ANTOLÍN, *Amada codiciosa y Edad de Oro en los elegíacos latinos*, unpublished Tesis de Licenciatura, Universidad de Sevilla 1991 (abridged in *Habis* 22 [1991] 207–221).
NEUE-WAGENER: F. NEUE and C. WAGENER, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*³, 4 vols., Leipzig, 1892–1905.
NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos*: E. NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte religiöser Rede*, Leipzig-Berlin: Teubner, 1913.
OCD: N. G. L. HAMMOND and H. H. SCULLARD (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*², Oxford, 1970.
OLD: P. G. W. GLARE (ed.), *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968–1982.
OTTO, *Sprichwörter*: A. OTTO, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer. Gesammelt und Erklärt*, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962.
PICHON: R. PICHON, *Index verborum amatoriorum*, from R. PICHON, *De sermone amatorio apud Latinos elegiarum scriptores*, Paris 1902, pp. 75–303 (repr. Hildesheim 1966).
PLATNAUER, *Latin Elegiac Verse*: M. PLATNAUER, *Latin Elegiac Verse. A Study of the Metrical Usages of Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid*, Handem, Connecticut: Archon Books 1971. See also NATHAN A. GREENBERG, "Metrics of the elegiac couplet," *CW* 80 (1986–1987) 233–241.
RACE, *Classical Priamel*: W. H. RACE, *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius*, Leiden: Brill 1982.
RADKE: G. Radke, *Die Götter Altitaliens*, Münster 1979.
RE: *Real-Encyclopäedie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, (Pauly-Wissowa) Stuttgart, 1893–1978.
RUIZ DE ELVIRA, *Mitología clásica*: A. RUIZ DE ELVIRA, *Mitología clásica*, Madrid: Gredos, 1975.
ROSCHER: W. H. ROSCHER (ed.), *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* (2 vols.), Leipzig, 1884–1937.
SCHUMANN, *LHL*: O. Schumann, *Lateinisches Hexameter-Lexicon. Dichterisches Formelgut von Ennius bis zum Archipoeta*, I–VI, München 1981.
SZANTYR, *Syntax*: A. SZANTYR, *Lateinische Syntax und Stylistik*, München: C. H. Beck, 1965.
ThLL: *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, Leipzig, 1900–.
ThLL onom.: *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae onomasticon*, Leipzig, 1909–1923.
TOYNBEE, *Death and Burial*: J. M. C. TOYNBEE, *Death and Burial in the Roman World*, 1971.
VAHLEN, *Opuscula*: J. VAHLEN, *Opuscula academica* I–II, Leipzig 1908 [I: Lygd. 2.10; 18; 23 ff.; 4.3–7; 23–26; 48; 64; 65 ff.; 5.27; 6.7; 43 ff.; 46; 52; 57; II: 2.17 ff.; 4.29–34; 65 ff.; cf. *Index*].

WALDE-HOFMANN, *LEW*: A. WALDE - J. B. HOFMANN, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1965⁴.
WATSON, *Axelson Revisited*: P. WATSON, "Axelson Revisited: the Selection of Vocabulary in Latin Poetry", *CQ* 35 (1985) 430–448.
WILLIAMS, *Trad. & Orig.*: G. WILLIAMS, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
WISSOWA, *RuK²*: G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* V 4, München 1912².

4. OTHER STUDIES

ADAMS, J. N.: "Latin Words for 'Woman' and 'Wife', *Glotta* 50 (1972) 234–255.

ALFONSI, L: *Albio Tibullo e gli autori del 'Corpus Tibullianum'*, Milano 1946 (reviews by B. ZANCO, *Aevum* 20 [1946] 290–295; J. CH. DUMONT, *LEC* 1947, 182; H. FUCHS, *Erasmus* 1947, 340–343; C. PRATO, *Paideia* 1947, 157–159; H. BARDON, *Latomus* 1948, 112–113; P. GRIMAL, *REA* 1948, 180–181; A. LA PENNA, *REL* 1948, 386–389; M. UNTERSTEINER, *MC* 1948, 1–2; F. MARTINS, *Humanitas* 2 [1948–1949] 514–515; A. ERNOUT, *RPh* 1949, 84; A. LA PENNA, *Annali della Scuola N. Suo. di Pisa* 1949, 112–118; J. GUILLÉN, *Helmántica* 1 [1950] 381–382; R. HANSLIK, *Gnomon* 23 [1951] 175–177; K. VRETSKA, *Gymnasium* 64 [1957] 203–204) [pp. 59–77 for Lygdamus].

ALLEN, S.: "Némethy's Tibullus and Lygdamus", *CR* 20 (1906) 449–456.

ALTON, E. H.: "Tibulliana", *CR* 52 (1938) 130–133.

ANDERSON, W. S.: "The Suppliant's Voice and Gesture in Vergil and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*" *ICS* 18 (1993) 165–177.

ANDRÉ, J.: "Le vocabulaire de la couleur", *REL* 19 (1941) 132–141.

ARENS, J. C.: "*-Fer* and *-Ger*. Their Extraordinary Preponderance among Compounds in Roman Poetry", *Mnemosyne* 3 (1950) 241–262.

ARIAS, C.: "*Albus-candidus, ater-niger* and *ruber-rutilus* in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. A Structural Research", *Latomus* 43 (1984) 111–117.

BAEZA ANGULO, E. F.: *La lengua y el estilo de las 'Epistulae ex Ponto' de Ovidio*, Universidad de Sevilla 1993.

BAKER, R. J.: "*Laus in amore mori*", *Latomus* 29 (1970) 670–698.

BALIGAN, G.: "Il terzo libro del *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Studi pubblicati dall'Istituto di Filologia classica della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università degli Studi di Bologna* I, Bologna, U. P. E. B., 1948, pp. 1–36.

BALIGAN, G.(-PARATORE, E.): "Ancora su Ligdamo", *Aevum* 24 (1950) 270–299 (Baligan on pp. 270–299).

BALIGAN, G.: "Il natalis di Ligdamo", *Vichiana* 4 (1967) 84–86 [Lygd. 5.17–18].

BAÑOS BAÑOS, J. M.: "El *versus aureus* de Ennio a Estacio", *Latomus* 51 (1992) 762–774.

BARAN, N. V.: "Les caractéristiques essentielles du vocabulaire chromatique latin (aspect général, étapes de développement, sens figurés, valeur stylistique, circulation)", *ANRW* II 29.1 (1983) 321–411.

BELTRÁN, M. T.-SÁNCHEZ-LAFUENTE, A.: "Sobre conjeturas al texto de Tibulo", in F. MOYA DEL BAÑO (ed.), *Simposio Tibuliano*, Univ. de Murcia 1985, pp. 205–216 [Lygd. 2.15; 3.36; 4.41; 87; 6.21; 46].

BELLIDO, J. A.: "El motivo literario de la *militia amoris* y su influencia en Ovidio", *Eclás* 31 (1989) 21–32.

BENNETT, CH. E.: "The Ablative of Association", *TAPhA* 36 (1905) 64–81.

BETELLI, E.: "Il *si* interrogativo e disgiuntivo in latino", *Athenaeum* 2 (1924) 143–146.

BICKEL, E.: "Die Lygdamus-Elegien. *Lygdamus* appellativisch *servus amoris*. Messalla Messallinus als Verfasser der Elegien", *RhM* 103 (1960) 97–109.

BIGNONE, E.: "Lygdamus 4,25 ss.", *RF* 1910, 416–418.

BIGNONE, E.: "Collectanea Latina", *RFC* 38 (1910) 402–420 [Lygd. 4.28].

BLÜMNER, H.: "*Umbilicus* und *cornua*", *Philologus* 73 (1916) 426–445.

BOSCHERINI, S.: "Un uso impersonale in Ligdamo (1.10–12)", *A & R* 4 (1959) 152–154.

BRÉGUET, E.: "Le thème *alius . . . ego* chez les poètes latins", *REL* 40 (1962) 128–136.

BRIGHT, D. F.: *Haec mihi fingebam. Tibullus in his World*, Leiden 1978.

Brouwers, J. H.: "*Ferreus ille fuit.* Sens et structure de Tibulle I.2.67–80", *Mnemosyne* 31 (1978) 389–406 (Lygd. 2.2 on p. 394).
Bürger, R.: "Eine Elegie des Gallus", *Hermes* 38 (1903) 19–27 [Lygd. 4].
Bürger, R.: "Studien zu Lygdamus und den Sulpiciagedichten", *Hermes* 40 (1905) 321–335 [Lygd. 1–3].
Butrica, J. L.: "Lygdamus, nephew of Messalla?", *LCM* 18.4 (April 1993) 51–53.
Calonghi, F.: "De Lygdamo Ovidii imitatore", *RF* 29 (1901) 273–278.
Calonghi, F.: "Il codice Beriano di Tibullo. Confronti e osservazioni", *Atti della Reale Accademia di Scienze di Torino* 51 (1916) 1229–1252; 1431–1463 (review by L. Dalmasso, *RF* 45 [1917] 144).
Calonghi, F.: "Un codice Tibulliano della R. Biblioteca dell' Escorial", *Historia* 4 (1930) 294–312.
Capodanno, F.: "Realtà e fantasia nelle elegie di Ligdamo", *Siculorum Gymnasium*, Catania, IV, 1951, pp. 75–84.
Castelli, G.: "Note a *Corp. Tibull.* III.6.2", *RSC* 21 (1973) 114–116.
Colmant, P.: "Les quatre âges de la vie: Horace, *Art Poétique, 153–175*", *Études Classiques* 24 (1956) 58–63.
Cook, E.: "Ferrymen of Elysium and the Homeric Phaeacians", *JIES* 20 (1992) 239–267.
Copley, F. O.: "*Servitium amoris* in the Roman Elegists", *TAPhA* 78 (1947) 285–300.
Courtney, E.: "Problems in Tibullus and Lygdamus", *Maia* 29 (1987) 29–32.
Cristóbal, V.: *Virgilio y la temática bucólica en la tradición clásica*, Universidad Complutense de Madrid 1980.
Currie, H. McL.: "Closure/transition and the *nox erat* topos: some notes", *LCM* 18.6 (June 1993) 92–95.
Christensen, H.: "*Que—que* bei den römischen Hexametriken (bis etwa 500 n. Chr.)", *ALL* 15 (1967) 165–210.
Damsté, P. H.: "Ad Lygdami elegias", *Mnemosyne* 36 (1908) 205–210.
Della Corte, F.: "Il codice Beriano CF Arm. 6", *La Berio* 3 (1963) 1–10.
Della Corte, F.: "Aspetti sociali del III. libro del *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Synteleia Vincenzo Arangio-Ruiz*, a cura di A. Guarino e L. Labruna, Napoli 1964, pp. 690–695 (= *Opuscula* III, Istituto di Filologia Classica e Medioevale, Università di Genova, Facoltà di Lettere, 1972, pp. 191–196).
Della Corte, F.: "Alle origini del *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Studi su Varrone sulla retorica storiografia e poesia latina. Scritti in onore di Benedetto Riposati*, Centro di Studi Varroniani, Rieti 1979, pp. 143–152 (= *Opuscula* VII, *Publicazioni dell'Istituto di Filologia Classica e Medievale* 77, Università di Genova, Facoltà di Lettere, 1983, pp. 91–100).
Delz, J.: "Apoll als verhinderter Sänger (zu [Tib.] 3.4.71), *MH* 48 (1991) 61–62.
Dettmer, H.: "The *Corpus Tibullianum* (1974–1980)", *ANRW* II.30.3 (1981) 1962–1975.
Dilke, O. A. W.: "*Magnus Achilles* and Statian Baroque", *Latomus* 22 (1963) 498–503.
Doinceux, G.: "Sur la personalité de *Lygdamus*", *RPh* 12 (1888) 129–134.
Donnet, D.: "Ovide, Properce et l'élégie latine", *EClass* 63 (1965) 253–279.
Du Mesnil, A.: "Zu Tibull III.6.17", *ZOeG* 30 (1876) 553–554.
Enk, J. P.: "Lygdamus", *REL* 27 (1949) 48–49.
Enk, J. P.: "Apropos du poète Lygdamus", *Mnemosyne* 3 (1950) 70–75.
Ernout, A.: "*Venus, venia, cupido*", *RPh* 82 (1956) 7–27.
Ernout, A.: "B. Axelson. *Unpoetische Wörter*", *RPh* 21 (1947) 55–70.
Évrard, É.: "Vieux et ancien chez Tibulle", *Latomus* 37 (1978) 121–147.
Ehwald, R.: "Zu Lygdamus c. I", *Philologus* 60 (1901) 572–578.
Fasciano, D.: "La notion de *fides* dans Catulle et les élégiaques latins", *RCCM* 24 (1982) 15–25.
Fischer, J. M.: "The Life and Work of Tibullus", *ANRW* II.30.3 (1981) 1924–1961 ("The Transmission of the *Corpus Tibullianum*" on pp. 1953–1958).
Fletcher, G. B. A.: "Latin *Marginalia*", *CQ* 25 (1931) 49–51 [Lygd. 3.21–22; 4.49–50; 89].

FORDYCE, C. J.: "R. G. Kent, Varro, *De lingua Latina* (London 1938)", *CR* 53 (1939) 131 [Lygd. 4.71].
FOULON, A.: "La mort dans la poésie augustéenne", in HINARD, pp. 351–364.
FOULON, A.: "L'art poétique de Tibulle", *REL* 68 (1990) 66–79.
FREYBURGER, G.: "Le *foedus* d'amour", in A. THILL (ed.), *L'élégie romaine. Enracinement. Thèmes. Diffusion*, Paris 1980, pp. 105–116.
FREYBURGER, G.: *Fides. Étude sémantique et religieuse depuis les origines jusqu'à l'époque augustéenne*, Paris; Société d'édition «Les Belles Lettres», 1986.
GARCÍA CALVO, A.: "*Quom* y la anástrofe primitiva", *Emerita* 19 (1951) 157–190.
GARCÍA FUENTES, Mª CRUZ: "Pasado y presente en la elegía de destierro del poeta de Sulmona", *Actas del VIII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos* (Madrid, 23–28 Septiembre 1991), Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas 1994, vol. II, pp. 659–665.
GARCÍA LEAL, A.: "Juventud y vejez en Tibulo", *Simposio Tibuliano* (ed. F. Moya de Baño), Universidad de Murcia 1985.
GIANGRANDE, G.: "Los tópicos helenísticos en la elegía latina", *Emerita* 42 (Madrid 1974) 1–36.
GIANGRANDE, G.: "The Cure for Love in Theocritus' *Idyll* XI", *Analecta Malacitana* 13.1 (1990) 5–9.
GIANGRANDE, G.: "Symptoms of Love in Theocritus and Ovid", *Analecta Malacitana* 13.1 (1990) 121–123.
GIPPER, H.: "Purpur", *Glotta* 42 (1964) 39–69.
GLADIGOW, B.: "Zum Makarismos des Weisen", *Hermes* 95 (1976) 404–433.
GOETZ, K. E.: "Waren die Römer Blaublind?", *ALL* 14 (1906) 75–88.
GOINS, SCOTT: "Two Aspects of Virgil's Use of *Labor* in the *Aeneid*", *CJ* 88 (1993) 375–384.
GÓMEZ PALLARÈS, J.: "Poetas latinos como «escritores» de *CLE*", *CFC(Lat)* 2 (1992) 201–230.
GONZÁLEZ OVIES, A: "El «más acá» en los epitafios latinos", *Actas del VIII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos* (Madrid, 23–28 Septiembre 1991), Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas 1994, vol. II, pp. 667–673.
GOW, A. S. F.: "Diminutives in Augustan Poetry", *CQ* 26 (1932) 150–157.
GUILLEMIN, A.: "L'évolution d'un cliché poétique", *REL* 19 (1941) 101–113 [Lygd. 5.7].
HÄGG, T.: "Hermes and the Invention of the Lyre. An Unorthodox Version", *Symb. Osl.* 64 (1989) 36–73.
HÅKANSON, L.: "Adverbs in Latin Poetry", *Eranos* 84 (1986) 23–56.
HELLEGOUARCH' J.: "*Parce, precor*... ou Tibulle et la prière. Étude stylistique", *Illinois Classical Studies* 14 (1989) 49–68.
HENDERSON, A. A. R.: "Tibullus, Elysium and Tartarus", *Latomus* 28 (1969) 649–653.
HERMANN, A.: "Das Steinharte Herz: zur Geschichte einer Metapher", *JbAC* 4 (1961) 77–107.
HERRMANN, L.: "La règle des dix-huit vers et le *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Latomus* 8 (1949) 47–54 [Lygd. 1].
HERRMANN, L.: "Le Pseudo-Lygdamus", *Latomus* 23 (1964) 726–749.
HERRMANN, L.: "Secrets et Structure du *Contre Ibis*", *Latomus* 27 (1968) 843–851.
HÖRSCHELMANN, W.: "Beobachtungen über die Elision bei Tibull und Lygdamus", *Philologus* 56 (1897) 355–371.
HOUSMAN, A. E.: "*Vester* = *tuus*", *CQ* 3 (1909) 244–248.
HUBBARD, M. H.: "Lygdamus", *OCD*², p. 630.
JACOBY, F.: "Amores", *RhM* 60 (1905) 463–464 [Lygd. 1.12].
KENT, R. G.: "Latin *Mille*, and Certain Other Numerals", *TAPhA* 42 (1911) 69–89.
KERSHAW, A.: "On Elegiac *En*", *CQ* 42 (1992) 282–284.

KERSHAW, A.: "A! and the elegist: more observations", *CPh* 78 (1983) 232–233.
KESSELS, A. H. M.: "Ancient Systems of Dream-Classification", *Mnemosyne* 22 (1969) 389–424.
KOENEN, L.: "Egyptian Influence in Tibullus", *ICS* 1 (1976) 127–159.
KONISHI, H.: "Muse, goddess of literacy", *LCM* 18.8 (October 1993) 116–121.
KRAUS, W.: "Lygdamus und Ovid", *WS* 70 (1957) 197–204.
KRAUS, W.: "Lygdamus", *Der Kleine Pauly* 3 (1969) 803–804.
LA PENNA, A.: "B. Riposati, *Introduzione allo studio di Tibullo* de *B. Riposati* (Como-Milano 1945)", *Annali della Scuola Normale Sup. di Pisa* 15 (1946) 131–136
LA PENNA, A.: "L. Alfonsi, *Albio Tibullo e gli autori del 'Corpus Tibullianum'*" (Milano 1946), *Annali della Scuola Normale Sup. di Pisa* 18 (1949) 112–118.
LA PENNA, A.: "Properzio e gli poeti latini dell'età aurea", *Maia* 4 (1951) 62–67.
LA PENNA, A.: "Note sul linguaggio erotico dell'elegia latina", *Maia* 4 (1951) 187–209.
LA PENNA, A.: "Ancora su Ligdamo e Ovidio", *A & R* 3 (1953) 105–110.
LASSO DE LA VEGA, J. S.: "El amor dorio", in *El descubrimiento del amor en Grecia*, Madrid 1959, pp. 59–103.
LEARY, T. J.: "That's what little girls are made of: the physical charms of elegiac women", *LCM* 15.10 (December 1990) 152–155.
LEARY, T. J.: "The intellectual accomplishments of the elegiac woman", *LCM* 18.6 (June 1993) 88–91.
LEASE, E. B.: "Notes on Latin Syntax", *AJPh* 30 (1909) 208–309.
LEASE, E. B.: "*I nunc* and *I* with another imperative", *AJPh* 19 (1898) 59–69.
LEE, A. G.: "The Date of Lygdamus and his Relationship to Ovidius", *PCPhS* (1958–1959) 15–23.
LEE, A. G.: "Tibulliana", *PCPhS* 20 (1974) 53–57.
LEONOTTI, E.: "Semantica di *durus* in Tibullo", *Prometheus* 16 (1990) 27–42.
LEVIN, D. N.: "War and Peace in Early Roman Elegy: V.1 Lygdamus", *ANRW* II.30.1, pp. 506–515.
LEVY, F. W.: "Lygdamus", *RE* 13.2 (1927) 2218–2226.
LIEBERG, G.: "Catull 60 und Ps. Theokrit 23", *Hermes* 94 (1966) 115–119.
LIEBERG, G.: "Le Muse in Tibulo e nel *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Prometheus* 6 (1980) 29–55; 138–152 [Lygd. 1; 4].
LINCOLN, B.: "The Hellhound", *JIES* 7 (1979) 273–285.
LISSBERGER, E.: *Das Fortleben der römischen Elegiker in der Carmina epigraphica*, Diss. Tübingen 1934.
LOUSIDÈS, L. L.: "Ὁ Λύγδαμος καὶ αἱ ἐλεγεῖαι αὐτοῦ", *EEATh* 7 (1956–1957) 365–384 (review by Ch. F. Floratos, *EAPhI* 1 (1960) 56–64.
LYNE, R. O. A. M.: "*Servitium Amoris*", *CQ* 29 (1979) 117–130.
MAGUINNESS, W. S.: "The singular Use of *Nos* in Virgil", *CQ* 35 (1941) 127–135.
MARINA SÁEZ, R. Mª: "El elemento simposíaco en la elegía latina", *Actas del VIII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos* (Madrid, 23–28 Septiembre 1991), Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas 1994, vol. II, pp. 727–735 [Lygd. 6].
MARIOTTI, Sc. (ed.): *Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi su Albio Tibullo*, Roma: Centro di Studi Ciceroniani 1986.
MARMORALE, E. V.: "Tibullo nacque nel 66 av. C.", *GIF* 1 (1946) 116–118.
MARTÍN RODRÍGUEZ, Mª T.: "De la *sententia* en la poesía amatoria de Ovidio", *Actas del VIII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos* (Madrid, 23–28 Septiembre 1991), Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas 1994, vol. II, pp. 738–744.
MARX, F.: "*Albius*", *RE* 1.1 (1893) 1317–1329.
MARX, F.: "Die Beziehungen des Altlateins zum Spätlatein", *NJb* 23 (1909) 434–448.
MCKAY, K. J.: "Lygdamus (Tibullus III) 1.7 f.", *Latomus* 46 (1987) 213–214.
MICHELS, A. K.: "The 'Calendar of Numa' and the Prae-Julian Calendar", *TAPhA* 80 (1949) 320–346.
MILLER, J. F.: "Propertius' Hymn to Bacchus and Contemporary Poetry", *AJPH* 112 (1991) 77–86.

MONTAÑÉS, A.: *Motivos y tópicos amatorios en las Elegías de Propercio*, unpublished Tesis de Licenciatura, Universidad de Sevilla, 1993.
MOYA DEL BAÑO, F. (ed.): *Simposio Tibuliano. Conmemoración del Bimilenario de la muerte de Tibulo*, Universidad de Murcia 1985.
MOYA DEL BAÑO, F.: "Función del mito de Apolo y Admeto en Tibulo", *Myrtia* 1 (1986) 27–42.
MÜLLER, K.: "Lucretiana", *MH* 33 (1976) 219–233.
MUNK OLSEN, B.: "Les classiques latins dans les florilèges médiévaux antérieurs au XIIIe siècle", *RHT* 9 (1979) 47–121.
MUNK OLSEN, B.: "Les classiques latins dans les florilèges médiévaux antérieurs au XIIIe siècle", *RHT* 10 (1980) 115–315.
MURGATROYD, P.: "*Militia Amoris* and the Roman Elegists", *Latomus* 34 (1975) 59–79.
MURGATROYD, P.: "*Servitium Amoris* in the Roman Elegists", *Latomus* 40 (1981) 589–606.
NAVARRO, F.: "*Iuravi stulte*: Tib. 3.19 (= 4.13)!, *Actas del VIII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos* (Madrid, 23–28 Septiembre 1991), Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas 1994, vol. II, pp. 799–804.
NAVARRO, F.: "Los *taedia vitae* o el suicidio elegiâco", *Actas del IX Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos* (Madrid, 27–30 Septiembre 1995, in print.
NÉMETHY, G.: "Horatiana", *RhM* 61 (1906) 139–140 [Lygd. 4.28].
NÉMETHY, G.: "Zur Ciris-Frage", *RhM* 62 (1907) 484–485.
NÉMETHY, G.: "Coniecturae in Tibullum", *RhM* 64 (1909) 470–473 [Lygd. 1.11].
NEWTON, F. L.: "Tibullus in two Grammatical *Florilegia* of the Middle Ages", *TAPhA* 93 (1962) 253–286.
NORMAN LEVIN, D.: "War and Peace in Early Roman Elegy", *ANRW* II.30.1, pp. 418–538 (pp. 506–515 for *Lygdamus*).
NOVARA, A.: *Les 'imagines' de l'Élysée virgilien*, in HINARD, pp. 321–350.
OGLE, M. B.: "III.-Laurel in Ancient Religion and Folk-Lore", *AJPh* 31 (1910) 287–311.
O'NEIL, E. N.: "Cynthia and the Moon", *CPh* 53 (1958) 1–8 [Lygd. 4.29–30].
PALLARÈS, J. G.: "Poetas latinos como «escritores» de *CLE*", *CFC(Lat)* 2 (1992) 201–230 (Lygd. 2.29–30 on pp. 224–225).
PARATORE, E.: "A proposito di due nuovi lavori su Ligdamo", *Aevum* 22 (1948) 278–308.
PARATORE, E. (-BALIGAN, G.): "Ancora su Ligdamo", *Aevum* 24 (1950) 270–299 (Parastore on pp. 291–299).
PARATORE, E.: "Sul problema dell' identificazione di Ligdamo con Ovidio", *Emerita* 20 (1952) 42–77.
PARATORE, E.: "Briciole filologiche", *Studi in onore G. Funaioli*, Roma 1955, pp. 317–353 ("Ancora su Ligdamo e Ovidio", pp. 332–339).
PARATORE, E.: "Spicilegio polemico", *RCCM* 4 (1962) 65–116 ("VII: Ancora di Ligdamo e Ovidio" on pp. 97–109).
PARCA, M.: "The Position of Lygdamus in Augustan Poetry", *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* IV, C. DEROUX (ed.), Bruselas 1986, pp. 461–474.
PASCHALIS, M.: "*Aut ego fallor aut ego laedor* (Ovid *Metamorphoses* 1.607–608). A witty tautology?", *Eranos* 84 (1986) 62–63.
PEPE, L.: *Tibullo minore*, Napoli: casa editrice Armanni, 1948 (reviewed by E. Bréguet, *MH* 1949, 238; *id.*, *REL* 1949, 314–316; F. Capodanno, *GIF* 1 [1948] 377–379; J. Ch. Dumont, *LEC* 1948, 423; E. Galletier, *REG* 1948, 515; L. Herrmann, *Latomus* 1948, 423; E. V. Marmorale, *GIF* 1 [1948] 116–118; E. Paratore, *Aevum* 1948, 278; 308; F. de Ruyt, *AC* 1949, 441–443; A. Oliver, *CW* 43 [1949] 44; F. H. Sandbach, *CR* 1949, 104–105; A. Ernout, *RPh* 1950, 118; A. I. Lana, *RFIC* 28 [1950] 171–173; M. Marín Peña, *Emerita* 18 [1950] 551–553; M. Lenchantin, *Athenaeum* 1950, 133–136; R. Hanslik, *Gnomon* 23 [1951] 177–178).

PEROTTI, P. A.: "L'infinito perfetto in Tibullo e nel *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Orpheus* 10 (1989) 141–149.
PIERI, M.-P.: "Due immagini tibulliane", *SIFC* 45 (1973) 60–87.
PIERI, M.-P.: "L'omaggio del libro in Ligdamo", *QILL* 4 (1982) 57–68.
PIERI, M.-P.: "Il testo di Tibullo nella critica dell'ultimo decennio", *C & S* 23 (1984) 29–45.
PIZZANI, U.: "Il *Corpus Tibullianum* e le sue aporie fra Medioevo e Umanesimo", in SC. MARIOTTI (ed.), *Atti del Convegno Internazionale di studi su Albio Tibullo*, Roma: Centro di Studi Ciceroniani 1986, pp. 141–166.
POSSANZA, D. MARK; "*Cornua* and *Frontes* in [Tibullus] 3.1.13", *CQ* 44 (1994) 281–282.
POSTGATE, J. P.: "On Some Tibullian Problems", *CQ* 3 (1909) 127–131 (pp. 130–131 for Lygdamus).
POSTGATE, J. P.: "Paralipomena: Tibullus", *CQ* 6 (1912) 40–43.
POSTGATE, J. P.: "*Neaera* as a Common Name", *CQ* 8 (1914) 121–122.
POWELL, J. U.: "A. Cartault: Tibulle et les auteurs du *Corpus Tibullianum*", *CR* 24 (1910) 124–127.
RADFORD, R. S.: "The Juvenile Works of Ovid and the Spondaic Period of his Metrical Art", *TAPhA* 51 (1920) 146–171.
RADFORD, R. S.: "Tibullus and Ovid. The Authorship of the Sulpicia and Cornutus Elegies in the Tibullan Corpus", *AJPh* 44 (1923) 1–26, 230–259, 293–318.
RADFORD, R. S.: "The Ovidian Authorship of the Lygdamus Elegies", *CPh* 22 (1927) 356–371; cf. *TAPhA* 57 (1926) 149–180.
RAMÍREZ DE VERGER, A.: "El amor como *servitium* en Tibulo", in F. MOYA DEL BAÑO (ed.), *Simposio Tibuliano*, Universidad de Murcia 1985, pp. 371–377.
RAMÍREZ DE VERGER, A.: "*Sacramentum amoris* in Tibullus", *Homenaje al Profesor J. M. Blázquez*, in print.
REAL TORRES, C.: "El vino como alimento y medicina en la sociedad romana", *Fortunatae* 3 (1992) 305–314.
REBELO GONÇALVES, M. I.: "Helenismos onomásticos do *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Euphrosyne* 16 (1988) 309–321.
REEVE, M. D.: "The *Codex Eboracensis* of Tibullus", *Maia* 25 (1973) 115–116.
REEVE, M. D.-ROUSE, R.H.: "Tibullus", in L. D. REYNOLDS (ed.), *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics*, L. D. REYNOLDS (ed.), Oxford 1983, pp. 420–425.
REINMUTH, O. W.: "Vergil's Use of *Interea*, a Study of the Treatment of Contemporaneous Events in Roman Epic", *AJPh* 54 (1933) 323–339.
REITZENSTEIN, R.: "Das *foedus* in der römischen Erotik", in *Catull*, Darmstadt, 1975, pp. 153–180.
ROBINSON, D. M.: "The Wheel of Fortune", *CPh* 41 (1946) 207–216.
ROCCA, R.: "Tibullo", *Dizionario degli scrittori Greci e Latini*, F. DELLA CORTE (ed.), Settimo Milanese: Marzorati 1988, vol. 3, pp. 2243–2256 (pp. 2248–2250 for Lygdamus).
ROHDE, G.: "*Ossilegium*", *RE* 17.2 (1942) 1599–1602 [Lygd. 2.19–26].
ROLOFF, K.-H.: "*Ritus*", *Glotta* 33 (1954) 36–65.
RUIZ DE ELVIRA, A.: "Problemas del calendario romano", *CFC* 11 (1976) 9–17.
SANDBACH, F. H.: "Guilty Men?-Lygdamus 5.7", *CR* 2 (1952) 6–7.
SAUVAGE, A.: "Tibulle et son temps", *Latomus* 28 (1969) 875–893.
SCHANZ M.-HOSIUS C.: *Geschichte der römische Literatur*, II (= *Handb. d. Altertumswissenschaft*, VIII.2 [München 1935), pp. 185–188 (§ 282 *Lygdamus*).
SCHILLING, R.: *Rites, cultes, dieux de Rome*, Paris: Klincksieck 1979.
SCHUSTER, M.: *Tibull-Studien. Beiträge zur Erklärung und Kritik Tibulls und des Corpus Tibullianum*, Wien 1930 (reviewed by M. BACHERLER, *BBG* 1931; F. CALONGHI, *BFC* 37 [1930] 69–80; L. HERRMANN, *BMB* 1930, 39; A. LUCAS, *CR* 1930, 233; L. CASTIGLIONI, *RFIC* 1931, 257–262; A. ERNOUT, *REL* 1931, 173; J. HAMMER, *CW* 25 (1931) 21–23; R. HELM, *PhW* 1931, 342–345; M. PONCHONT, *RPh* 1931,

366–367; F. Solmsen, *DLZ* 1931, 1935–1939; H. T. Rowell, *AJPh* 1942, 230–238) [Lygd. 1.8; 9–12; 3.38; 4.4; 65–66; 5.11–12; 6.1–4].

Setaioli, A.: "I *Carmina Epigraphica* e tre poete latini", *Prometheus* 2 (1976) 67–77 [Lygd. 5.17–18].

Shackleton Bailey, D. R.: "On an Idiomatic Use of Possessive Pronouns in Latin", *CR* 68 (1954) 8–9 [Lygd. 3.28].

Skiadas, A. D.: "*Periuria Amantum.* Zur Geschichte und Interpretation eines Motivs des augusteichen Liebesdichtung", *Monumentum Chiloniense. Festschrift für E. Burck*, Amsterdam 1975, 400–418.

Skutsch, O.: "*Cum cecidit fato consul uterque pari (III.5.18)*", *Philologus* 103 (1959) 152–154.

Skutsch, O.: "Zur Datierung des Lygdamus", *Philologus* 110 (1966) 142–146.

Skutsch, O.: "Lygdamus 1.19", *Philologus* 113 (1969) 156–157.

Skutsch, O.: "Lygdamus 1.17 ss.", *ZPE* 37 (1980) 168.

Smith, K. F.: "Notes on Tibullus", *AJPh* 37 (1916) 131–155 [Lygd. 3.11; 13; 16; 4.63; 5.4; 6.56].

Sobrino, O.: "*Nunc* en Tibulo", *CFC(Lat)* 2 (1992) 129–132.

Solimano, G.: "Il mito di Apollo e Admeto negli elegiaci latini", *Mythos. Scripta in Honorem M. Untersteiner*, Istituto di Filologia Classica e Medioevale, Università di Genova, Facoltà di Lettere, 1970, pp. 255–268.

Swoboda, M.: "Autorzy trzeciej ksiegi tzw. *Corpus Tibullianum*", *Eos* 58 (1969) 99–114 (summary in Latin on pp. 113–114: "De *Corporis Tibulliani* tertii elegiarum auctoribus").

Steele, R. B.: "The Endings *-ere* and *-erunt* in dactylic Hexameter", *AJPh* 32 (1911) 328–332.

Tescari, O.: "Tibulliana", *Convivium* (1937) 549–573.

Thörnell, G.: "Analecta critica", *Eranos* 32 (1934) 142–158 [Lygd. 4.4].

Tracy, V. A.: "The Poet-Lover in Augustan Elegy", *Latomus* 35 (1976) 575–581.

Traina, A.: "*Primus dies natalis*", *Maia* 18 (1966) 279–280.

Tränkle, H.: "Zum ersten Lygdamusgedicht", *ZPE* 35 (1979) 23–28.

Ullman, B. L.: "Tibullus in the Mediaeval *Florilegia*", *CPh* 23 (1928) 128–174.

Veremans, J.: "L'anaphore dans l'oeuvre de Tibulle", *AC* 50 (1981) 774–800.

Vessey, D. W. T. C.: "The Myth of Falernus in Silius, *Punica* VII", *CJ* 68 (1972) 240–246.

von der Müll, P.: "Il simposio greco", in M. Vetta (ed.), J. Trumpf (trans.), *Poesia e simposio nella Grecia Antica: guida storica e critica*, Roma-Bari 1983, pp. 5–28.

Wagenvoort, H.: "De Lygdamo poëta deque eius sodalicio", *Mnemosyne* 45 (1917) 103–122.

Wagenvoort, H.: "*Caerimonia*", *Glotta* 26 (1938) 115–131 (= *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion*, 1956, pp. 85–101).

Wagenvoort, H.: "De dea Cerere deque eius mysteriis Romanis", *Mnemosyne* 13 (1960) 111–142.

Watson, P.: "*Puella* and *Virgo*", *Glotta* 61 (1983) 119–143.

Watt, J. S.: "Five Notes on the Corpus Tibullianum" *Maia* 43.1 (1991) 15–16 [Lygd. 6.25].

Weinreich, O.: "Catull c. 60", *Hermes* 87 (1959) 75–90 [Lygd. 4.85–94].

Wijdeveld, G.: "Ad Lygdamum 1.21", *Mnemosyne* 11 (1942–1943) 79–80.

Williams, G. D.: "Representations of the Book-Roll in Latin Poetry: Ovid. *Tr.* 1.1.3–14 and the related Texts", *Mnemosyne* 45 (1992) 178–189.

Wimmel, W.: *Der frühe Tibull*, Monaco 1968.

Wohl, B.: "The Phenomenon of *Sperrung* in Tibullus' Elegies", *TAPhA* 104 (1974) 385–428.

Wölfflin, Ed.: "*Frustra, nequiquam* und Synonyma", *ALL* 2 (1885) 1–24.

Wölfflin, Ed.: "*Sescenti, mille, trecenti* als unbestimmte und runde Zahlen", *ALL* 9 (1896) 177–192.

5. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL WORKS

BALL, R. J.: "Recent Work on Tibullus", *Eranos* 73 (1975) 62–68.

DETTMER, H.: "The *Corpus Tibullianum* (1974–1980), *ANRW* II 30.3 (1983) 1962–1975.

FABIA, PH.: "Un siècle d'études Tibulliennes", *JS* 1907, pp. 316–333; 352–360.

HERESCU, N. I.: "Tibullus et le *Corpus Tibullianum*: Lygdamus, Sulpicia", *Bibliographie de la Litterature Latine*, Paris 1943, pp. 189–194 (§§ 347–351).

HARRAUER, H.: *A Bibliography to the 'Corpus Tibullianum'* (*Bibliography to Augustan Poetry* I), Hildesheim: Verlag Dr. H. A. Gerstenberg 1971 (reviews in F. CUPAIOLO, *BStudLat* 2 [1972] 104; E. KUTÁKOWÁ, *LF* 95 [1972] 127; G. K. GALINSKI, *Am. Class. Rev.* 2 [1972] 254–255; S. VIARRE, *AC* 42 [1973] 278; J. C. O'NEIL, *CPh* 68 [1973] 313–314; G. E. THUERY, *AAHG* 26 [1973] 112–113; E. J. KENNEY, *CR* 24 [1974] 138; J. CLASSEN, *Gymnasium* 83 [1976] 146–147). Reference to earlier bibliographical works on Tibullus on p. 9.

KROLL, W.: *Forschungsbericht zu Lygdamus*, Gotha 1920.

MILITERNI DELLA MORTE, P.: "Rassegna di Studi Tibulliani (1971–1983)", *BStudLat* 14 (1984) 83–119.

MURGATROYD, P.: "Tibullus. A review article", *EMC* 31 (1987) 69–92.

PEPE, L.: "Rassegna di studi Tibulliani", I, *GIF* 1 (1948) 159–168; II, *GIF* 3 (1950) 173–180.

PIERI, M.-P.: "Il testo di Tibullo nella critica dell'ultimo decennio", *C & S* 23 (1982) 645–659.

RADKE, G.: "Fachbericht: Tibull und das *Corpus Tibullianum*, Properz, Ovid", *Gymnasium* 71 (1964) 104–108.

6. LEXICOGRAPHICAL WORKS

DELATTE, L.: "Key-words and poetic themes in Propertius and Tibullus", *Rev. de l'Organisation Intern. pour l'Étude des Lang. Anc. par ordinateur* 3 (1967) 31–80.
DELLA CASA, A.: *Le concordanze del 'Corpus Tibullianum'*, Istituto di Filologia Classica e Medioevale, Università di Genova, Facoltà di Lettere, Genova 1964.
GLASS, B. P.: *Index Tibullianum*, Hildesheim 1970.
GOVAERTS, S.: *Le 'Corpus Tibullianum'. Index verborum et relevés statistiques. Essai de méthodologie statistique*, Univ. de Liège 1966.
O'NEIL, E. N.: *A Critical Concordance of the Tibullian Corpus*, Philol. Monogr. Publ. by the American Philological Association 21, Ithaca 1964.

APPENDIX

LYGDAMVS I

	Navarro	Postgate (1915^{2})	Cartault (1909)	Lenz-Galinsky (1971)	Luck (1988)	Tränkle (1990)	Lee (1990^{3})
2	hinc	hic	hic	hic	hinc	hic	hic
3	certa	certa	certa	certa	crebra	certa	certa
8	meis	novis	meis	tuis	tuis	†meis†	tuis
10	pumex et	pumicet et	pumicet et	pumicet et	pumex cui	pumex et	pumex et
	arte	ante	ante	ante	ante	ante	ante
11	charta	chartae	charta	carthae	charta	charta	chartae
12	facta	facta	facta	facta	picta	†facta†	facta
13	inter	inter	inter	inter	infra	inter	inter
16	umbram	umbram	umbram	umbram	undam	umbram	umbram
19	referte mihi	mihi referet	mihi referet	mihi referet	mihi referet	mihi referat	mihi referet
	sit nostri	si nostri	si nostri	si nostri	sit nostri	sit nostri	si nostri
	mutua cura	mutua cura est	mutua curast	mutua cura est	mutua cura	mutua cura	mutua cura est

LYGDAMVS II

	Navarro	Postgate (1915^{2})	Cartault (1909)	Lenz-Galinsky (1971)	Luck (1988)	Tränkle (1990)	Lee (1990^{3})
8	nata	nata	nata	nata	nota	nata	nata
9	ergo cum	ergo cum	ergo cum	ergo cum	ergo ego cum	ergo cum	ergo cum
10	super	supra	supra	super	super	super	supra
11	ante meum	ante meum	ante meum	ante meum	ante meum	*dub.* ante urbem	ante meum
15	precatae	recentem	rogatam *vel* vocatam	precatae	precatae	recentem	recentem
18	legant	legent	legent	legent	legent	legant	legent

	Navarro	Postgate	Cartault	Lenz-Galinsky	Luck	Tränkle	Lee
19	spargant	spargent	spargent	spargent	spargant	spargant	spargent
20	ventis	velis	velis	velis	velis	velis	velis
23	illic	illic	illuc	illic	illuc	illuc	illic

LYGDAMVS III

	Navarro	Postgate	Cartault	Lenz-Galinsky	Luck	Tränkle	Lee
9	tunc cum	tunc cum	tunc cum	tum cum	tum cum	tunc cum	tunc cum
36	canunt	canunt	neunt	neunt	neunt	canunt	neunt
38	Ditis et	dives in	dives in	Dives in	Dis et in	†dives in†	dives in
	ignavam	ignava	ignava	ignava	ignaram	ignava	ignava
	aquam	aqua	aqua	aqua	aquam	aqua	aqua

LYGDAMVS IV

	Navarro	Postgate	Cartault	Lenz-Galinsky	Luck	Tränkle	Lee
1	mihi somnia	mihi somnia	mihi somnia	mihi somnia	insomnia	mihi somnia	mihi somnia
3	vani	vani	vani	vani	vanum est	vanum	vani
	falsumque	falsumque	falsique	falsumque	falsumque	falsumque	falsumque
	visus	visum	visus	visum	visum	visum	visus
4	in ventis	in nobis	in nobis	in nobis	in nobis	in nobis	in nobis
5	divae	divi	divi	divi	divi	divi	divi
	venturi	venturae	venturae	venturae	venturae	venturae	venturae
	sortes	sortis	sortis	sortis	sortis	sortis	sortis
9	natum in curas	†natum maturas†	natum in curas	natum in curas	natum in curas	†natum maturas†	natum in curas
11	illi	illi	illi	illi	illi	illis	illi
	monenti	monenti	moneri	moneri	moneri	moneri	moneri
12	solent	solent	volent	volent	volent	solent	volent
14	pertimuisse	pertimuisse	pertimuisse	pertimuisse	praetimuisse	pertimuisse	pertimuisse
20	deficit ante	deficit ante	deficit ante	deficit ante	deserit ille	deficit ante	deficit ante

	Navarro	Postgate	Cartault	Lenz-Galinsky	Luck	Tränkle	Lee
25	non vidit	non illo	non illo	non illo	non vidit	non †illo†	non illo
26	humanum	humanum	aut hominum	humanum	humanum	†humanum†	aut hominum
	nec fuit	nec videt	nunc videt	nec videt	nec fuit	†nec videt†	nunc videt
	illud opus	ulla domus	ulla domus	illud opus	illud opus	†illud opus†	ulla domus
28	myrrhea	myrrhea	myrtea	myrtea	myrrea	murrea	myrrea
33	et cum	et cum	et cum	et cum	aut cum	et cum	et cum
34	et	et	et	et	ut	et	et
35	alludere	inludere	illudere	inludere	illudere	inludere	illudere
39	veniens	veniens	veniens	veniens	feriens	veniens	veniens
42	dulci tristia	dulci tristia	tristi dulcia	tristi dulcia	dulci tristia	dulci tristia	tristi dulcia
45	Semelae	Semelae	Semelae	Semeles	Semeles	Semelae	Semeles
49	dico	dico	dico	dico	dico	dicam	dico
50	quodque	quamque	quodque	quodque	quodque	quidque	quodque
	feram	ferar	feram	feram	feram	feram	feram
59	tuis	suas	suis	suas	tuis	tuis	tuis
64	prece	prece	fide	fide	prece	fide	fide
66	posse	posse	saeva	posse	posse	posse	posse
71	permulcenti	perlucenti	perlucenti	perlucenti	perlucenti	perlucenti	perlucenti
87	anguina	anguina	anguinea	anguinea	anguina	anguinea	anguina
96	irrita	inrita	impia	inrita	irrita	irrita	irrita

LYGDAMVS V

3	nunc autem	nunc autem	aemula nunc	nunc autem	nunc autem	nunc autem	nunc autem
	proxima	proxima	maxima	proxima	proxima	proxima	proxima
7	virorum	virorum	virorum	virorum	virorum	virorum	reorum
8	docere	docere	docere	docere	docere	†docere†	docere
10	trita	trita	trita	trita	taetra	trita	trita

	Navarro	Postgate	Cartault	Lenz-Galinsky	Luck	Tränkle	Lee
11	sacrilegi	sacrilegos	sacrilegi	sacrilegi	sacrilegi	sacrilegos	sacrilegos
	admovimus	admovimus	amovimus	amovimus	amovimus	admovimus	admovimus
	ignes	ignes	aegros	aegros	ignes	ignes	ignes
13	insana	insanae	insanae	insanae	insana	insanae	insanae
	mente	mentis	mentis	mentis	mente	mentis	mentis
14	adversos	adversos	adversos	adversos	aversos	adversos	adversos
27	torrear	terrear	terrear	terrear	torrear	terrear	terrear
32	velint	velint	velint	velint	volent	velint	velint

LYGDAMVS VI

1	rustica	mystica	mystica	mystica	mystica	mystica	mystica
2	feras	feras	feras	feras	geras	feras	feras
3	aufer	aufer	aufer	aufer	affer	aufer	aufer
	meum	meum	meum	meum	merum	meum	meum
	patera	patera	pariter	patera	pater et	patera	pariter
	medicante	medicante	medicande	medicante	medicare	medicare	medicando
4	Amor	Amor	amor	amor	amor	amor	Amor
6	en	et	et	et	et	et	et
8	Delius	Delius	Delius	Delius	Delius	Delius	Euhius
13	dites	mites	dites	dites	dites	mites *fort. recte*	mites
15	Armenias	Armenias	Armenias	Armenias	Armeniasque	Armenias	Armenias
19	in illis	in illis	in illis	in illis	in illos	in illis	in illis
21	convenit	*dub.* nam venit	et venit	convenit	at venit	†non† venit	convenit
	nimiusque	nimiumque	nimiumque	nimiumque	nimiumque	nimiumque	nimiumque
	severis	*dub.* severis	severis	severos	severis	severis	severos
23	qualis	qualis	qualis	qualis	deus hic	qualis	qualis
	quantusque	quantusque	quantusque	quantusque	quantasque	quantusque	quantusque

	Navarro	Postgate	Cartault	Lenz-Galinsky	Luck	Tränkle	Lee
25	si quis	si qua est	si quast	si qua est	siqua est	si qua est	si qua est
32	multos	multas	multos	multos	nimbos	multas	multas
39	Cnosia	Gnosia	Gnosia	Cnosia	Cnosia	Cnosia	Cnosia
44	cavere tuum	cavere tuom	cavere tuos	cavere tuo	cavere tuo	cavere tuum	cavere tuo
46	sordida	sordida	sordida	sordida	subdola	subdola	sordida
47	iurabit	iuravit	iuravit	iuravit	iurabit	iurarit	iuravit
51	iura	verba	verba	verba	verba	verba	verba
52	procul	precor	precor	precor	procul	precor	precor
55	nec amica	†inimica†	inimica	inimica	nec amica	†inimica†	inimica
59	fugit	fugit	fugit	fugit	fugiat	fugit	fugit
62	tu puer i	tu puer i	tu puer i	tu puer i	i puer et	tu puer i	tu puer i

INDEX AVCTORVM

ABEL, W. 415; 524
ADAMS, J.N. 142 (2); 205; 243; 362
ALFONSI, L. 4 n. 1; 9 n. 31; 13 *et* nn. 53, 54; 23 n. 4; 28 n. 12; 351
ALLEN, S. 60; 63; 172 (2); 322
ALTHEIM, F. 100; 146; 421; 467
AMALFY, LORENZO D' (= LAVRENTINVS AMALFITANVS) 32, 50
ANDRÉ, J. 40; 162; 225 (2); 253; 286 (2); 287; 309; 310; 312; 314; 320; 321; 441
ANDERSON, W.S. 365
ANDREAE, B. 246
APPEL, G. 245; 442; 464; 468 (3); 477
ARENS, J.C. 431
ARGENTARIVS, FLORENTIVS 46
ARIAS ABELLÁN, C. 163
ASHBY, T. 429; 520 (2)
AVRISPA, LYSANDER 35; 49; 65
AUSTIN, R.G. 98; 103; 116; 171; 197; 209; 221; 225; 283; 307; 341; 379; 380; 398; 400; 401; 410 (2); 483; 488; 498; 499; 502; 512
AVANTIVS, HIERONIMVS 44
AXELSON, B. 19 *et* n. 84; 110; 119 (2); 125; 132 (2); 133; 142; 160; 187; 212; 215; 222; 227 (2); 245; 302; 316; 317; 320; 324; 333; 335; 345; 348; 353 (2); 356; 362; 380 (2); 385; 390 (2); 410 (2); 411; 418; 424; 425; 436; 438; 440; 450; 452; 489; 490; 491; 495; 500; 511; 512
AYRMANN, CH.F. 7 *et* n. 20; 14; 54; 69; 132
BACH, E.C.CHR. 5 n. 4; 39; 43; 54; 56; 57; 61; 63; 67; 72; 73; 130; 168; 307; 418
BAEHRENS, E. 8 n. 24; 16 *et* n. 72; 26 *et* n. 6; 26 n. 1; 34 n. 13; 35 *et* n. 19; 36 n. 25; 37; 39; 43; 53; 54; 55; 57; 60; 61; 63; 64; 65; 66; 68; 69; 71; 72; 73; 74; 75; 122; 132; 263; 266; 267; 272; 285; 302; 340; 388; 389; 431; 434; 466; 474; 476; 478; 489; 493; 516
BAER, E. 309
BAILEY, C. 207; 354
BAKER, R.J. 192; 370
BALIGAN, G. 8 *et* n. 29; 11; 21 n. 1; 22 n. 3; 27 n. 9; 69; 101; 128; 176; 205; 333; 352
BAÑOS BAÑOS, J.M. 201
BARAN, N.L. 320
BARDON; H. 283
BARLOW, C. 32 n. 3
BARRAN, N.V. 287
BARRATT, P. 98; 103; 144; 156; 183; 197; 200; 202; 206; 255; 383; 390; 401; 425; 431; 435; 437; 443; 458; 495; 498; 517
BARRETT, W.S. 363
BASSOLS DE CLIMENT, M. 103; 125; 132; 139; 153; 161; 191 (2); 199; 231; 234; 274 (2); 275; 297; 322; 324; 330; 332; 335; 337; 342; 351 (2); 355 (2); 358; 377; 379; 385; 387; 388; 404; 409 (2); 416; 418; 425; 450; 453; 455; 480; 490; 496; 523
BAUER, C.F. 98
BAUZÁ, H.F^co 40
BECKER, G.AD. 43; 54; 120
BÉLIS, A. 327
BELL, A.J. 228
BELLIDO, J.A. 370
BELLING, H. 35 n. 22; 39; 43; 50; 69; 71
BELOCH, K.-J. 420
BENNETT, CH.E. 166; 197; 458; 528
BERGK 43; 58; 74; 197; 509
BERNHARDY, G. 16 n. 71
BERTOCCHVS, DIONYSIVS 48
BESSILCH, S. 95; 124
BESSKICH, S. 406
BETELLI, E. 132
BEZZENBERGER, A. 256
BIANCHI, R. 35 n. 18
BICKEL, E. 11 *et* n. 40
BICKERMANN, E. 100
BIGNONE, E. 63; 302
BILLANOVICH, GUIDO 35 n. 23; 36 n. 28; 37 n. 29
BIRT, TH. 28 *et* nn 13, 14; 31 n. 2; 54; 71; 113; 115; 122 (2); 123; 280; 470

Bischoff, B. 31 n. 2; 34 n. 10
Bloomfield, M. 400
Blümner, H. 54; 122; 123; 170; 179; 215; 216; 221; 225; 241; 304
Boehlau, C. 12 *et* 46
Bolle, L. 12 *et* n. 45; 43; 61; 72; 73; 265; 493
Bömer, F. 102; 104; 129; 133; 135 (2); 142; 145; 151; 155; 156 (2); 157; 158 (2); 162; 163; 164; 165; 167; 168; 169; 170; 171; 175 (2); 176 (2); 178; 179 (3); 181; 186; 187 (3); 189; 190; 197; 199; 202; 203; 213; 217; 220; 221; 234; 238 (2); 241; 242 (2); 243 (2); 244 (2); 246; 247 (5); 248; 249; 253; 254; 255; 256; 257; 266; 269; 270; 273; 276 (2); 279; 280 (3); 281 (4); 284; 286 (4); 288; 289; 292; 294 (3); 295 (2); 297; 304; 305; 308; 314 (2); 322; 323 (3); 325 (3); 326; 327; 330; 331; 332; 336 (2); 339; 340 (2); 341 (2); 342; 344 (2); 349 (2); 354; 355; 356; 357 (2); 360; 361; 362; 365 (2); 367; 371; 376 (2); 378; 379 (2); 381; 383 (2); 384; 385; 388 (2); 389; 391 (2); 400 (2); 401; 402; 403 (2); 404; 405; 406; 407; 410; 415; 416 (2); 418 (2); 421; 423; 424 (3); 425; 432; 433; 435; 436 (2); 438; 439 (3); 441 (2); 444 (2); 445; 446; 447 (2); 448 (2); 452 (2); 453; 457; 458 (2); 466; 467; 468; 473; 477 (2); 478; 483; 485 (3); 487; 493; 494; 495 (2); 497 (3); 499; 499; 501 (3); 502; 503 (4); 512; 517 (2); 518; 519; 522; 524 (2); 525 (2); 526
Bonjour, M. 220 (2)
Boscherini, S. 53; 118; 121
Bowersock, G.W. 183
Bowra, M. 505
Braemer, F. 216
Bramble, J.C. 216
Brandt, P. 205
Braunfels, W 31 n. 2
Bréguet, E. 111; 241–242; 242
Bright, D.F. 375
Brink, C.O. 338; 418
Broughton, T. Robert S. 7 n. 20
Brovkhvsivs, I. (= J. van Broekhuyzen) 4–5 n. 4; 22 n. 3; 39; 43; 44; 45; 46; 50; 53; 54; 55; 56; 57; 58; 59; 60; 61; 62; 63; 64; 65; 66; 67; 68; 69; 70; 71; 72; 73; 74; 75; 101; 122; 134; 137; 138; 168; 255; 263; 264; 265; 267; 272; 274; 276; 279; 285; 307; 340; 346; 347; 358; 372; 387; 389 (2); 391; 399; 420; 430; 434; 435; 452; 466; 469; 470; 514
Brouwers, J.H. 149
Bruchmann, F.H. 341; 350
Brugnola, V. 6 n. 17
Bruhl, A. 467; 501
Büchner, K. 19 n. 86; 72; 133; 144; 160; 215; 223; 245; 261; 302; 320; 333; 353; 356; 390; 490; 491; 500
Bürger, R. 147; 260; 261
Burmann, P. 43; 48; 64; 501
Butler, H.E. 407
Burton, R. 33 n. 7
Butrica, J.L. 12 n. 41; 35 n. 20
Cairns, F. 114; 152; 237; 464; 505
Calonghi, F. 16 *et* n. 74; 17; 37; 39; 43; 64; 69; 73; 333; 433
Calphvrnivs, Ioannes 48
Calvo, A.G. 161
Camps, W.A. 321
Capelli, A. 514
Cartault, A. 4 n. 1; 11 n. 38; 14 *et* n. 57; 23 n. 4; 26 *et* n. 2; 26 n. 1; 39; 44; 53; 54; 56; 57; 63; 64; 65; 68; 69; 72; 73; 74; 118; 265; 267; 272; 302; 303; 333; 340; 358; 372; 418; 431; 433; 466; 470; 509
Carter, J.B. 146; 250; 286; 345; 350; 421; 502
Castelli, G. 71; 465; 466
Castiglioni, L. 63; 67
Cèbe, J.-P. 228
Cerda, J.L. de la 210
Christensen, H. 103
Ciaffi, V. 5 n. 6; 14 n. 60; 15
Citroni, M. 95; 115; 179; 462; 475
Clausen, W.v. 113; 116; 124
Clinton, K. 477
Coffey, M. 374
Colafrancesco, P. 151; 190; 333; 480
Coleman, K.M. 118; 215; 222; 225; 232; 379; 397; 419; 452; 486
Colmant, P. 424
Comitibus, F. de 38
Conrad, C. 101
Cook, E. 402; 446
Copley, F.O. 114; 372; 375
Costa, C.D.N. 443
Courbin, P. 327
Courtney, E. 60; 73; 104; 452; 477

Cristóbal, V. 198; 466
Cuenca, L.A. de 302
Cuiacius, Jac. 37
Cupaiolo, F. 506
Currie, H.McL. 287
Curtius, E.R. 105; 283
Cyllenivs Veronensis, Bernardinvs 38; 39; 44; 47; 54; 55; 57; 58; 61; 63; 64; 65; 67; 73; 168; 268 (3)
Dahlmann, H. 524
Dale, A.M. 422
Damsté, P.H. 44; 54; 58; 62; 69; 73; 121; 505
Daremberg, C. 97; 525
D'Arms, J.H. 420 (2)
De Beauvais, Vincent (= Vincentivs Bellovacensis) 28 n. 28; 33; 50; 56; 59; 60; 61; 66; 69; 71; 73; 74
De Boninis de Ragvsia, Boninvs 43
De Comitibvs, Federicvs 38; 46
De Dekker, J. 16 *et* n. 68
De Fournival, Richard 33 *et* n. 10; 34 *et* n. 11
De Golbéry, Ph.A. 10 *et* nn. 35, 36; 14; 15 n. 63; 22 n. 3; 43; 53; 55; 57; 60; 61; 62; 63; 64; 65; 66; 68; 69; 70; 71; 72; 73; 74; 75; 136; 279; 340; 377; 430; 455; 476
Del Corno, D. 259
Delisle, L. 34 n. 11
Della Corte, F. 12 n. 44; 19 n. 86; 21 n. 1; 23 n. 5; 26 n. 5; 31 n. 2; 40; 260
Delz, J. 377
De Mazalibvs, Albertvs 47
De Medici, Cosimo 34
Deroux, C. 114; 349
De Spira, Wendelinvs 38; 46
Dewar, M. 226; 342; 468
Diehl 460
Diels, H. 484
Dilke, O.A.W. 282
Di Pastrengo, Guglielmo 36 *et* n. 26
Dirichlet, G.J. 236
Dissen, L. 4 n. 2; 6 *et* nn. 10, 19; 7 *et* n. 20; 12–13 *et* n. 47; 22 n. 3; 39; 44; 45; 53; 55; 57; 60; 62; 63; 64; 66; 67; 72; 74; 123; 137; 206; 265; 275 (2); 335; 340; 377; 431; 438; 466; 470; 489
Dodds, E.R. 325
Doncieux, G. 10 *et* nn. 32, 37; 14
Dovsa, Ianvs (*pater et filius*) 4 n. 4; 39; 44; 45; 58; 74; 358; 511
Draeger, A. 401
Druckenmüller, A. 224
Dubois, Ch. 218
Dudley, D.R. 193
Dümmler, Ferdinand 246
Dziatzko, K. 53; 54; 119; 123
Easterling, P.E. 113
Ebert, Friedrich 221
Eden 62
Egger, Émile 525
Ehwald, R. 4 n. 2; 53; 108; 119; 382
Eichholz, D.E. 238
Eitrem, Samson 401
Elder, T.P. 114
Ellis, R. 184; 501
Engbers, B. 6 *et* n. 13
Enk, P.J. 15 *et* n. 61; 197; 295; 313; 330; 419; 504
Erath, W. 15 n. 62; 68; 114; 122; 125; 428; 439
Ernout, A. 99; 103; 111 (2); 125; 132; 139; 150; 153; 161; 184; 191; 199; 227; 231; 234; 274 (2); 275; 297; 322; 324; 330; 332; 335; 337 (2); 342; 355; 358; 363; 377; 379; 385; 387; 388; 404; 409 (2); 416; 418; 425; 450; 453; 455; 495; 496; 512; 523
Escolar, H. 113
Esteve Forriol, J. 180; 444
Evans, H.B. 117; 406; 520
Évrard, É. 101; 102; 207; 341; 424; 448; 449 (2)
Eyben, E. 307
Fabricius, B. 63; 307
Fantazzi, Ch. 455
Farnell, L.R. 291; 292; 375; 428; 445
Fasciano, D. 510
Fedeli, P. 110; 116; 128; 149 (2); 173; 177; 179; 183 (2); 187; 191; 195; 205; 208; 209; 210; 214; 217 (2); 219 (2); 228; 235; 236; 237; 239; 240; 272; 286; 303; 310 (2); 325; 338; 348; 366; 368; 369 (3); 371; 390 (2); 411 (2); 415; 417; 419 (2); 431; 445; 453; 463; 467; 468 (2); 483; 487; 489; 504 (2); 505; 507; 508; 510 (2); 515; 518; 522; 524
Fiesel, Eva 379
Fisher, J.M. 31 n. 1; 33–34 n. 10; 35 n. 15; 37 n. 30

Flagg Gummere, J. 401
Fletcher, G.B.A. 102; 162; 166; 228; 275; 346; 355; 383; 384; 391; 403; 408; 411; 425; 439; 443; 444; 479; 482; 488; 496; 499; 500
Fontenrose, J.E. 292 (4); 293; 294; 304; 313; 331; 339; 349 (3); 350; 379; 387; 478
Forbes, R.J. 225; 312; 314
Forcellini, A. 200; 203; 209; 360
Fordyce, C.J. 115; 116; 129; 140 (2); 149; 185; 202; 210; 213; 232 (2); 239; 252; 256; 278; 284; 290; 305; 308; 311; 313 (2); 315 (2); 317; 335; 370; 392; 396 (2); 410; 411; 419; 449; 454 (2); 455; 468; 475; 503; 507; 512 (2); 523
Foulon, A. 373; 375; 506 (2)
Fournier, Eug. 525
Fracastorivs 374
Fraenkel, E. 18 n. 80; 366; 442; 498 (2); 510; 521
Francken, C.M. 61
Frazer, J.G. 99; 168; 400 (2); 401; 402
Frentz, W. 373
Freyburger, G. 510; 514
Friedländer, L. 214; 420; 514
Frisk, H. 175; 339; 501
Fruterivs 72; 74; 511
Furtwängler, W. 375
Fuss, M.W. 4 n. 5; 15 n. 63
Gagnér, A. 33 n. 7
Galinsky, G.C. 40; 45; 53; 57; 63; 64; 68; 69; 72; 73; 74; 122; 267; 333; 340; 358; 433; 466; 469; 489; 509
García Fuentes, Mª Cruz 406
García Leal, A. 424; 448
Gebhardvs, Ianvs 39; 44; 45; 62; 359
Geisau, von 218
Getty, R.J. 228
Giangrande, G. 369; 450; 460; 462; 470
Gierig, G.E. 172
Gil Fernández, L. 338
Gipper, H. 225
Gladigow, B. 236
Gnoli, R. 216
Godel, R. 289
Goetz, G. 35 n. 20
Goetz, K.E. 287
Goins, S. 371
Goldmann, E. 418
González Ovies, A. 454
Goodyear, F.R.D. 127; 187; 222
Gow, A.S.F. 115; 179; 184; 239; 305; 449; 512
Graevius, I.G. 39
Graf, F. 201
Gray 325
Greifenhagen, A. 429
Grenier, A. 431
Griffin, J. 526
Grimal, P. 104; 146; 245; 248; 256; 298; 398; 400; 403; 418 (2); 421; 429; 430; 447; 467; 491; 511; 519
Groeneboom, P. 449
Gross, W.H. 176; 519
Gruppe, O.F. 7 *et* n. 22; 8 *et* n. 24; 9; 291; 292
Guarino, A. 23 n. 5
Gudeman, A. 134; 504
Guglielmino, F. 23 n. 5
Guilielmvs 72; 74
Guillemin, A. 155; 412
Guillén, J. 336
Guirand, F. 248; 256; 301; 421; 467; 491
Guiraud, Ch. 294
Gundel, W. 417
Guthrie, W.K.C. 128
Gvyetvs 5; 44; 53; 57; 61; 62; 66; 67; 70; 71; 73; 74; 119; 267; 505
Haase, F. 7 *et* n. 21; 26 n. 1
Hagen, B. 18 *et* n. 83; 19
Hagendahl, H. 98
Hägg, T. 326
Hailer, Ed. 13 *et* n. 51
Håkanson, L. 409
Hallam, G.H. 172
Halliday; W.R. 270
Hamacher, J. 33 nn. 7, 8
Hankey, V. 218
Hanslik, R. 16 *et* n. 77
Harrington, K.P. 202
Harriott, R. 338
Hartenberger, R. 160; 366
Hartmann, J. 40
Harvey, R.A. 232; 233
Haupt, M. 27 n. 8; 39; 54; 348; 447; 518
Hauser, M. 334
Havet, L. 44; 54; 55; 57; 59; 61; 62; 63; 64; 71; 72; 73; 120; 333
Heckenbach, J. 171
Heichelheim, Fritz Moritz 519

HEINSIVS, N. 35; 44; 50; 53; 54; 57; 59; 60; 61; 62; 63; 66; 67; 68; 70; 71; 73; 74; 75; 132; 168; 215 (2); 238; 250; 254 (2); 267; 289; 435; 452; 509; 514
HEINZE, R. 213; 331; 340; 390; 468
HÉLIN, M. 410
HELLEGOUARC'H, J. 245; 276; 443
HELM, R. 40; 54; 64; 65; 69; 131; 275; 432
HELZLE, MARTIN 415
HENDERSON, A.A.R. 446
HENNIG, F. 18 *et* n. 82
HERAEUS, W. 213
HERESCU, N. 101
HERRERA ZAPIÉN, T. 40
HERMAN, J. 348
HERMANN, A. 152; 395
HERRMANN, L. 12 n. 43; 16 *et* n. 76; 40; 44; 53; 54; 58; 59; 61; 62; 63; 65; 66; 70; 71; 72; 73; 74; 277; 303; 358
HERTER, HANS 128
HEUBNER, H. 163
HEURGON, J. 281
HEUSCH, H. 192; 337; 383
HEY, O. 121
HEYNE, CH.G. 4 *et* n. 4; 23 n. 4; 39; 45; 53; 54; 55; 57; 59; 60; 61; 62; 63; 64; 65; 66; 67; 68; 69; 70; 71; 72; 73; 74; 75; 122; 132; 139; 207; 263; 264; 265; 267; 272; 275; 283; 290; 302; 307; 340; 357; 358; 399; 428; 430; 455; 466; 470; 509; 516; 525
HILLER, E. 13 *et* n. 49; 26 n. 1; 39; 45; 47; 53; 57; 64; 68; 122; 265; 267; 340
HINARD, F. 446
HOEUFFT 56
HOFMANN, J.B. 99 (2); 103; 107; 125; 127; 132; 139; 140 (2); 146; 150; 153; 155 (3); 161; 163; 169; 191 (2); 197 (2); 198; 199; 207; 213; 228; 231; 232; 234 (2); 236; 248; 256; 263; 269; 270; 274 (2); 275; 277; 287; 290; 297; 322; 324; 327; 329; 330; 332; 335 (2); 337; 340; 342; 344; 348; 352; 353; 355 (2); 358; 361; 363; 377; 379; 380; 381; 383; 385; 387; 388; 401; 404 (2); 409 (2); 416; 418 (2); 419; 423; 425; 441 (2); 450; 451; 452; 453; 455; 458; 467; 474; 480; 490; 493 (2); 495; 498 (3); 499; 504; 511; 517; 523; 524 (2)
HOLLIS, A.S. 149; 266; 288; 338; 419; 466; 471
HOLLSTEIN 504
HOPFNER, T. 462
HÖRSCHELMANN, W 6 *et* n. 16
HOSIUS, C. 4 n. 1; 26 n. 5
HOUSMAN, A.E. 69; 71; 73; 156; 255; 353; 498; 503
HOWELL, P. 95; 118; 139; 305; 312; 419 (2); 462; 513; 524
HUBAUX, J. 180
HUBBARD, M.E. 20 n. 87; 145; 149; 169; 175; 179; 183; 193; 195 (3); 203; 205; 206; 209 (2); 211 (2); 213; 214; 215; 216; 217; 220; 221 (3); 223; 224; 226; 229; 230 (2); 231; 232; 235; 237; 249; 254; 303; 304; 308 (4); 310 (3); 311; 320; 325; 326; 338 (3); 341 (2); 347; 350; 351; 357; 369; 371; 381; 383; 395 (2); 398 (2); 401; 403; 407 (2); 412; 422; 425; 441; 442; 443; 444; 446; 449; 458; 460; 463; 464; 466; 467; 469; 472; 473; 475; 479; 480 (2); 484; 486; 497; 505; 515; 519–520; 521; 525; 526 (2)
HUBBARD, T. 114
HÜBNER, E. 450
HUG, AUG. 180
HUMBERT, M. 139
HUNGER, H. 36 n. 25
HUS, A. 369
HUSCHKE, IMM.G. 5 n. 6; 15; 39; 45; 53; 55; 56; 57; 58; 61; 63; 65; 66; 67; 68; 71; 73; 75; 119; 136; 137; 231; 377; 418; 427; 493; 511; 523; 525
HUSCHKE, PH.E. 100
IACOBUTIVS 49
IACVINVS, IOANNES 44
IMMISCH, O. 401
JACOB, O. 187
JACOBY, F. 122; 461
JÄGER, F. 237
JAHN, O. 180; 185; 232; 233
JEANMAIRE, H. 501
JEBB, R.C. 489
JESSEN, OTTO 291
JOCELYN, H.D. 36 n. 27; 220; 283
KAJANTO, I. 248
KALINKA, E. 16 *et* n. 73; 17; 26 n. 1
KAMBYLIS, A. 128
KAPP, I. 382

Kassel, R. 423
Kay, N.M. 95; 115; 123; 140; 190; 205; 213 (2); 225 (2); 232; 266; 311; 348; 380; 402; 419; 420; 462; 473; 475 (2); 520 (2); 524
Keightley, Th. 172
Keil, J. 238
Kenney, E.J. 74; 113; 116; 124; 197; 207; 228; 302; 503
Kent, R.G. 213
Kern, Otto 430
Kershaw, A. 361; 474
Kessels, A.H.M. 262
Kiessling, A. 185; 213; 331; 340; 390; 468
Kirsopp Michels, A. 100
Kibel, W. 180; 185; 293 (2); 294
Kleemann, S. 6 *et* n. 14; 8 n. 24; 500
Kleingunther, A. 149
Klotz, A. 98
Klug, E. 32 n. 5
Kneppers, H. 11 *et* n. 39
Knight, W.F. Jackson 453
Knoche, U. 18 n. 83
Knox, M.W. 113
Koenen, L. 69; 427 (2); 433
Koestermann, E. 222; 340
Konishi, H. 105
Korn, O. 382
Korzeniewski, D. 477
Kost, K. 133; 287; 302; 317; 416; 449; 482
Kraffert, H. 45
Kraggerud, E. 248
Kranz, W. 484
Kraus, W. 18 *et* n. 81
Krause 456; 457
Kreis-v. Schaewen, R. 323 (2)
Kroll, W. 193; 227; 231; 490
Krummrey 452
Kübler, P. 173
Kühner, R. 103; 125; 127; 132; 139; 153; 155; 161; 184; 191 (2); 197; 199; 231; 274 (2); 275; 297; 322; 324; 330; 332; 335; 337; 358; 366; 377; 383; 385; 387; 388; 390; 401; 404; 409; 416; 418; 425; 450; 453; 455; 458; 469; 495; 496; 512; 517; 523
Labruna, L. 23 n. 5
Lachmann, C. 6 *et* n. 9; 26 n. 1; 39; 44; 45; 47; 50; 53; 54; 55; 57; 61; 63; 64; 67; 68; 69; 72; 73; 74; 137; 263; 264; 265; 266; 272; 302; 335; 340; 372; 390; 431; 466; 470; 474; 488
Laguna Mariscal, G. 176; 185; 198; 200; 202; 205 (2); 210; 215; 216; 226; 233; 240; 244; 245; 253; 281; 283; 286; 304; 305; 314; 315; 324; 358; 370; 374; 402; 417; 419; 443; 444; 445; 452; 468 (2); 473; 477; 518; 522
Langen, P. 132
Langermann 66
La Penna, A. 9 *et* n. 31; 10 n. 36; 22 n. 3; 144; 205; 246; 251; 288; 323; 450; 470; 501
Lasso de la Vega, J.S. 305; 375
Latte, Kurt 97; 146; 169; 248; 277; 429; 430; 510
Lattimore, R. 158; 169; 178; 186; 423; 444
Laurens, P. 514
Lausberg, H. 141; 150; 155; 166; 176; 196; 200; 226; 255; 391; 416 (2); 442; 517; 518–519
Leary, T.J. 110 (2); 301; 305; 311; 312; 314
Lease, E.B. 381; 409; 458; 493; 495; 517; 524
Le Boeuffle, A. 313; 417
Le Bonniec, H. 421
Lee, A.G. 19 *et* n. 85; 45; 53; 54; 56; 57; 61; 63; 64; 65; 68; 71; 72; 73; 74; 132; 168; 265; 267; 268 (2); 302; 333; 340; 358; 367; 381; 399; 427; 431; 433; 436; 466; 470; 476; 489
Lejay, P. 185; 390
Lenaz, L. 144; 246; 251; 323
Lenchantin de Gubernatis, M. 505
Lenotti, E. 152
Lenz (= Levy), F.W. 4 n. 1; 16 *et* n. 75; 17 *et* n. 79; 36 nn. 24, 27; 37; 40; 45; 50; 53; 57; 61; 63; 64; 65; 68; 69; 72; 73; 74; 122; 131; 207; 267 (2); 272; 333; 340 (3); 358; 431; 433; 469; 489; 509
Leo, F. 71; 133; 198
Leroy, M. 180
Lesky, A. 286
Leumann, M.L. 163; 366
Levin, D.N. 152
Levine, P. 114
Lieberg, G. 53; 105; 108; 129; 335; 382; 395

Lier, B. 158; 423
Lilja, S. 180; 307; 526; 527
Lincoln, B. 256; 400
Lipsius, J. 23 n. 4; 38; 45; 61; 65; 66; 69; 70; 71; 75; 138 (2); 358
Lissberger, E. 158; 190; 242; 246; 247; 297
Littlewood, R.J. 463
Livineivs, I. 44; 45; 54; 72; 75; 120; 488
Löfstedt, B. 452
Löfstedt, E. 99; 223; 347; 348; 401; 475; 488; 523
Lousidès, L.L. 16 n. 70
Lovati, Lovato 36
Luck, G. 35 nn. 19, 21; 40; 45; 50; 53; 54; 56; 57; 60; 61; 62; 63; 64; 65; 67; 68; 69; 70; 71; 72; 73; 74; 75; 101; 102; 115; 116; 117; 121; 123; 124 (4); 128; 134 (2); 161; 165; 179; 207; 233; 238; 263; 266; 267; 272; 276; 279; 289; 340; 358; 367; 379; 393; 395; 399; 406; 410; 430; 432; 434; 435; 449; 452; 455; 466; 469; 470; 487; 499; 506; 516; 523
Lunderstedt, R. 200
Lyne, R.O.A.M. 105; 119; 127; 154 (2); 199; 206; 236; 279; 283; 285; 318; 321; 344; 345; 356; 369; 372; 369; 379; 390; 396; 409; 437; 454; 463; 474; 483; 489; 494; 503; 511
Maas, P. 401; 488
Mackauer, W. 256
Macleod, C. 366; 463
Maguinness, W.S. 156
Maiuri, A. 246
Maltby, P. 277; 319; 339; 345; 349; 387; 419; 467; 501
Manvtivs, A. 43; 47
Marbach, Ernst 14.1051
Marchesi, C. 8 n. 24
Mare, A.C. de la 35 n. 16
Marina Sáez, R.Mª 460; 525; 526; 527
Markland, J. 62; 290; 467
Marmorale, E.V. 16 *et* n. 66
Marotti, Sc. 18 n. 80
Marouzeau, J. 98; 99; 127; 161; 163; 202; 324; 401
Marquardt, J. 97; 115; 123; 215; 225; 270; 326; 475
Martín, R. 406
Martin, R. 218 (2)
Martín Rodriguez, Mª T. 157
Martinon, Ph. 39
Martil, R. 217
Marx, F. 132; 260; 345; 389
Massaro; M. 151; 190; 333; 480
Mau, A. 115; 185; 225; 326
Maurin, J. 424
Mayor, J.E.B. 104; 179; 215; 225; 326; 374; 517
McKay, K.J. 53; 108; 326
McKay, L.A. 244
McKeown, J.C. 111; 151; 155; 165; 166; 169; 170; 177; 197; 202; 203; 204 (3); 209; 241; 287; 302; 304; 317 (2); 324; 326; 330; 337; 353; 358; 368; 383; 395; 421; 424; 429; 440; 448; 451; 467; 473; 482; 484; 487; 493; 494; 499; 509; 513; 515; 524; 526
Meillet, A. 99
Meleager, I. 44; 45
Mendell, C.W. 221 (2)
Merkelbach, R. 427
Meyncke, G. 33 n. 7
Miller, J.F. 338; 349; 463
Miller, J.I. 180; 181; 182 (2); 199; 309
Mineur, W.H. 326
Mitscherlich 71; 72
Moldenke, A.L. 309
Moldenke, H.N. 309
Mommsen, Th. 97; 100
Monteil, P. 111
Montero Cartelle, E. 107; 205; 243; 245; 515
Mørland, H. 287
Moya del Baño, F. 372, 373
Mulder, H.M. 314; 401; 443
Müller, L. 6 *et* n. 12; 32 n. 5; 36 *et* nn. 26, 27; 39; 46; 53; 54; 57; 58; 60; 61; 62; 63; 64; 65; 71; 72; 74; 120; 197; 263; 340; 388; 402; 431; 474; 489
Munari, F. 379
Munk Olsen, B. 32 nn. 5, 6; 33 n. 7; 36 n. 26
Munro, H.A.J. 265
Mvretvs, M.A. 4 n. 2; 22 n. 3; 39; 46; 53; 54; 55; 57; 59; 60; 61; 62; 63; 64; 65; 66; 67; 68; 69; 70; 72; 73; 74; 75; 108; 122; 132; 136; 138; 168; 263; 264; 266; 267 (2); 272 (3); 273; 274; 309; 340; 358; 365; 373; 387 (2); 408; 433; 465; 469; 470; 493

Murgatroyd, P. 40; 103; 176; 183; 197; 206; 230; 234; 240; 264; 266; 273; 281; 298; 304; 321; 328; 333; 339; 341; 343; 352 (2); 356; 369 (2); 370 (2); 372 (2); 375; 384; 395; 400; 411; 415; 417; 425; 432; 449; 450; 453; 457; 467 (2); 468 (2); 473 (2); 475; 490; 499; 506 (2); 510
Musurillo, H. 304
Mynors, R.A.B. 149; 181; 231; 236; 240; 251 (2); 256; 285; 286; 313; 326; 366; 369; 373; 431
Namia, G. 40
Nash, E. 520
Navarro Antolín, F. 109; 111; 112; 148; 158; 194; 222; 358; 363; 513
Némethy, G. 39; 40; 46; 53; 54; 57; 60; 62; 63; 64; 71; 72; 74; 102; 115; 120; 127; 171 (2); 172 (2); 173; 309; 377; 489; 525
Nencini, F. 34 n. 13
Neue; F. 98; 402
Neumann, E. 385
Newlands, C.E. 194
Newton, F.L. 32 nn. 5, 6
Nilsson, M.P. 99; 100; 466; 501 (2)
Nisbet, R.G.M. 98; 139; 145; 149; 169; 175; 179; 183; 193; 195 (3); 203; 204; 206; 209 (2); 211 (2); 213; 214; 215; 216; 217; 220; 221 (4); 223; 224; 226; 229; 230 (2); 231; 232; 235; 237; 249; 254 (2); 303; 304; 308 (4); 310 (3); 311; 320; 325; 326; 338 (2); 341 (2); 347; 350; 351; 357; 369; 371; 381; 383; 395 (2); 398 (2); 401; 403; 407 (2); 412; 422; 425; 441; 442; 443; 444; 446; 449; 458; 460; 464; 466 (2); 467; 469; 472; 473; 475; 479; 480 (2); 484; 486; 497; 498; 505; 515; 519–520; 521; 525; 526 (2)
Norden, E. 25; 101; 103; 116; 197; 198; 202; 209; 210; 231; 236; 276; 281; 324; 335; 340 (2); 341; 369; 400; 401 (2); 405; 433; 464; 468; 484; 485; 487; 498
Nováková, J. 162
Novara, A. 446
Odoardvs, Prospervs 47
Oebeke, Fr. 6 *et* n. 19; 7 *et* n. 20; 14
Ogle, M.B. 299 (2)
O'Neil, E.N. 313
Opelt, I. 152
Osthoff, H. 256
Otón Sobrino, E. 40
Otto, A. 143; 144; 152 (2); 183; 209; 228 (2); 231; 232; 233; 239; 240; 241 (2); 256; 314; 320; 347; 361 (2); 364; 370; 392; 395; 403; 412; 462; 447; 462; 475; 484; 497; 503
Otto, W.F. 169; 248; 511
Owen, S.G. 100
Page, D.L. 179; 239; 305
Paley, F.A. 172 (2)
Pallarès, J.G. 189
Papageorgakis, Ioh. 218
Paquette, D. 327
Paratore, E. 9 nn. 29, 31; 10 n. 36; 13 n. 54; 14 *et* n. 60; 16 *et* n. 67; 19 n. 86; 21 n. 1; 23 n. 5; 27 n. 10; 28 n. 14; 128
Parca, M. 114; 117; 144; 261; 368; 375; 427; 496; 516
Parke, H.W. 128
Paroli, P. 6 *et* n. 17
Paschalis, M. 106
Pasquali, G. 93; 406
Passerativs, Io. 46; 57; 60; 63; 66; 67; 73; 74; 307
Passow, F. 4 n. 2
Pease, A.S. 154; 155; 225; 270 (2); 273; 276 (2); 283; 287 (2); 294; 305; 322; 338; 407; 422; 443; 449; 462; 480; 524
Pepe. L. 4 n. 1; 7 n. 20; 16 *et* nn. 67, 70; 23 n. 4; 27; 28 *et* n. 14
Pérez Vega, A. 233
Perotti, P.A. 197 (2); 279; 527
Peter, R. 248; 256; 430
Petrarch 36 *et* n. 24
Petreivs (*vel* Perreivs), A. 46; 56; 61; 65; 66; 68; 71
Petrvs, Henrico 47
Pfeiffer, R. 115; 317
Pfister, Friedrich 354
Phaklares, P. 327
Pichard, L. 40; 46; 54; 55; 56; 57; 59; 61; 62; 63; 64; 65; 67; 68; 69; 71; 72; 73; 74; 340; 358; 433; 489; 493; 509
Pichon, R. 106 (2); 110; 111; 112; 125; 131; 134; 151 (3); 152; 153; 158; 234; 289; 311; 352 (2); 360; 362 (2); 363 (2); 364; 371; 376; 382; 384 (4); 388; 391 (2); 411; 437; 449; 451; 471; 477; 482 (3); 484; 487; 497; 499; 500; 507; 514; 515; 522
Pieri, M.-P. 114; 120; 398; 399

Pinotti, P. 205
Pirrone, N. 6 n. 17
Pizzani, U. 31 n. 1; 36 n. 28
Plantinvs, Christophorvs 46
Platnauer, M. 100; 107; 116; 155; 160; 183; 197; 226; 278; 314; 335; 343; 347; 348; 351; 366; 380 (2); 390; 405; 410; 416; 488; 494; 505
Platner, S.B. 429; 520
Plessis, Fr. 10 n. 33
Ponchont, M. 10 nn. 33, 36; 23 n. 5; 26 *et* n. 4; 40; 44; 46; 56; 57; 59; 63; 64; 72; 73; 74; 207; 265; 267; 340; 431; 466; 470; 509
Pontanvs, Johannes Jovianvs 35; 46; 49; 54; 59; 65; 132
Possanza, D. Mark 54; 123
Postgate, J.P. 13 *et* n. 52; 39; 46; 53; 56; 57; 60; 61; 62; 63; 64; 67; 70; 71; 72; 73; 74; 75; 107; 108; 114; 168; 171 (2); 275 (2); 302; 340; 346 (3); 377; 399; 431; 466
Pöstgens, P. 468
Prehn, Bruno 350
Privitera, G.A. 338
Protzen, E. 32 n. 5
Puccioni, G. 431
Puccivs, F. (= F. Pocchi) 47; 56; 57; 59; 60; 63; 65; 73; 74; 75; 514
Pulmann, Theod. 39; 46; 47; 66; 68
Putnam, M.C.J. 40; 280; 471
Quinn, K. 114; 506
Race, W.H. 148; 194; 195; 211; 241; 391
Radford, R.S. 8 *et* n. 25
Radke, G. 146; 169; 256; 277; 281; 380; 421; 430; 511
Ramírez de Verger, A. xi; 149; 280; 368; 370; 372; 411; 504; 513
Raphelengivs, Fr. 44
Rauk, J.N. 237
Real Torres, C. 470
Rebelo Gonçalves, M.I. 422
Rebuffat, R. 281
Reeve, M.D. 31 n. 1; 32 nn. 5, 6; 33 nn. 7, 10; 34 n. 12; 35 n. 22
Reinmuth, O.W. 456
Renensis, Ioannes 48
Reinhold, M. 225
Reirzenstein, R. 507
Reuschel, H. 341
Reynolds, L.D. 31 n. 1; 32 nn. 5, 6; 33 nn. 7, 10; 34 n. 12
Ribbeck, O. 13 *et* n. 55; 26 n. 1
Richter, O. 33 n. 9
Richter, W. 485
Riposati, B. 9 n. 31; 10 nn. 34, 36; 26 n. 1; 26 n. 5; 27 nn. 10, 11
Robathan, D.M. 33 n. 8
Robberts, H. 327
Robert, L. 217
Robin, L. 495
Robinson, D.M. 228; 480
Rocca, R. 21 n. 1
Rohde, G. 170; 180
Rohden, P. von 183
Roloff, K.-H. 337
Rommel, Hans 222
Ronconi, A. 117
Roscher, W.H. 129; 146 (2); 168; 248; 256; 281; 379; 401; 402; 421; 430; 467
Rose, H.J. 100; 291
Ross, D.O. 114; 202; 283; 352; 496
Rossbach, A. 39; 43
Rostagni, A. 8 *et* n. 28; 11 n. 38; 14 n. 59; 16 *et* n. 69; 27 *et* nn. 7, 10; 31 n. 2
Rothstein, M. 144; 156; 461; 487
Rouse, R.H. 31 n. 1; 32 nn. 5, 6; 33 nn. 7, 10; 34 nn. 11, 12
Rouveret 217; 218 (2)
Rovillivs, G. 46
Rüdiger, H. 36 n. 25
Ruiz, E. 113
Ruiz de Elvira, A. 100; 104; 248; 284; 288; 292; 298; 350; 375 (2); 398; 400; 402; 403; 418; 421; 491; 519
Russell, D.A. 338; 444
Sabbadini, R. 35 n. 17; 36 *et* nn. 24, 25, 27; 37
Saglio, E. 97; 525
Salantiro, N. 8 *et* n. 27; 23 n. 5
Salutati, Coluccio 34; 35
Sandbach, F.H. 68; 427; 428
Sanders, G. 247
Santen 73; 498
Santoro, A. 5 n. 6; 8 n. 26; 15
Sauter, F. 281
Sauvage, A. 155; 464
Scaliger, J. 4 *et* n. 4; 38; 39; 44; 47; 49; 50; 53; 54; 55; 56; 57; 58; 59; 60; 61; 62; 65; 66; 67; 68; 69; 71; 72; 73; 74; 101; 136; 137; 264; 265; 387; 427; 431; 430; 433; 474; 509; 525
Schaffner, E. 495
Schilling, R. 219; 270; 354
Schneider, Karl 331

Schrader, H. 47; 48; 72
Schanz, M. 4 n. 1; 26 n. 5
Schneider, K. 180
Schulten, Adolf 241
Schumann, O. 133; 140; 153; 157; 200; 205; 208 (2); 298; 357; 434
Schuster, M. 47; 53; 60; 61; 64; 65; 69; 71; 108; 253 (2); 433
Scioppivs (= Schoppes) 68; 417
Seibel, Fr. 452
Sellar, W.Y. 13 *et* n. 50
Setaioli, A. 10 n. 36
Shackleton Bailey, D.R. 157; 169; 179; 218; 219; 238; 417; 504
Shmatz, J. 420
Skånland, V. 223
Skiadas, A. 513
Skutsch, O. 16 *et* n. 78; 17 *et* n. 79; 54; 131
Slusanski, D. 424
Smith, K.F. ix; 11 n. 38; 36 n. 24; 40; 47; 53; 63; 64; 69; 98; 103; 104; 153; 156; 162; 166; 171; 197; 207; 209; 228; 230; 267; 273; 285; 323; 324; 340; 369; 379; 400; 417; 425; 446 (2); 449; 457; 466; 495 (2); 506; 528
Snell, B. 236
Socas Gavilán, F. 368; 411
Solimano, G. 375
Solís de los Santos, J. xi
Solmsen, F. 463; 504
Sommer, F. 503
Soria, C. 525
Spies, A. 370
Spira, W. de 38
Spohn, F.A.G. 5 n. 4
Staffhorst, U. 525
Stativs, Achilles 23 n. 4; 39; 47; 54; 55; 56; 57; 58; 59; 60; 61; 62; 63; 64; 65; 66; 67; 68; 69; 70; 71; 72; 73; 74; 75; 119; 130; 132; 136; 138 (2); 150; 168; 177; 263; 264; 266; 267; 272 (2); 274; 274; 340; 358; 365; 465; 523
Steele, R.B. 98
Stegmann, C. 103; 125; 127; 132; 139; 153; 155; 161; 184; 191 (2); 197; 199; 231; 234; 274 (2); 275; 297; 322; 324; 330; 332; 335; 337; 358; 366; 377; 383; 385; 387; 388; 390; 404; 409; 416; 418; 425; 450; 453; 455; 469; 495; 496; 517; 523
Steier, August 299; 307
Stein, Otto 403
Steininger, Emil 305
Stemplinger, E. 180
Stephanvs, H. 44
Stearns 287
Streifinger, J. 6 *et* n. 15
Stroh, W. 122; 231; 367
Svennung, J. 192
Swoboda, M. 463
Szantyr, A. 99; 103; 125; 127; 132; 139; 150; 153; 155; 161; 163; 191 (2); 197 (2); 198; 199; 207; 213; 228; 231; 234 (2); 236; 269; 274 (2); 275; 277; 290; 297; 322; 324; 327; 329; 330; 332; 335 (2); 337; 340; 342; 344; 348; 353; 355 (2); 358; 363; 377; 379; 381; 383; 385; 387; 388; 404; 409 (2); 416; 418; 425; 441 (2); 450; 451; 452; 453; 455; 458; 490; 493 (2); 495; 498; 504; 511; 517; 523; 524
Tarrant, R.J. 228; 283; 344; 383; 401; 402; 444; 449; 452; 456; 468 (2); 494; 503; 519
Tescari, O. 14 *et* nn. 58, 59; 22 n. 3; 40; 47; 53; 55; 56; 57; 61; 63; 64; 65; 72; 74; 115; 172; 173; 302 (2); 340; 388; 489; 509
Teuffel, W.S. 8 n. 24; 13 *et* n. 48; 26 n. 3
Thanner, Iac. 45
Thill, A. 220; 476; 514
Thiry, H. 402
Thomamüller, K. 198
Thomas, E. 370
Thomas, F. 103; 125; 132; 139; 150; 153; 161; 184; 191; 199; 231; 234; 240; 274 (2); 275; 297; 322; 330; 332; 335; 337 (2); 342; 355; 358; 363; 377; 379; 385; 387; 388; 404; 409 (2); 416; 418; 425; 450; 453; 455; 467; 496; 523
Thomas, R.F. 202; 213; 324
Thompson 158
Thörnell, G. 61; 267
Thulin, C. 270 (2)
Törnebladh, R. 6 *et* n. 11
Toynbee, J.M.C. 162; 164; 167; 170; 174; 178 (2)
Tracy, V.A. 382
Traina, A. 10 n. 36
Tränkle, H. 19 n. 86; 22 n. 3; 28 *et* n. 15; 34 n. 13; 40; 47; 54; 56; 57; 60; 62; 64; 65; 67; 71; 72; 73; 74;

100; 102; 106; 115; 124 (2); 127; 131; 132; 134; 138; 144; 164 (2); 168 (2); 177; 215; 218; 222; 240 (2); 241; 245; 254; 264; 265; 274; 275; 276; 283; 290; 316; 320; 333; 340; 342; 346 (2); 358; 367; 382; 397; 413; 428 (2); 431 (2); 433; 447; 452; 457; 466; 470; 477; 478; 489; 490; 514; 516; 518
TRUMPF, J. 460; 527
TURCAN, R. 483
TURNER, E.G. 124
TVSCANELLA, HORATIVS 39; 47; 54; 57; 120
ULLMANN, B.L. 31 n. 2; 32 n. 4; 33 *et* nn. 7, 8, 9; 34 *et* nn. 11, 14, 15; 35 n. 20; 36 *et* nn. 24, 27
ULLRICH, R. 28 n. 13
USENER, H. 401; 402
VAHLEN, J. 36 n. 25; 39; 54; 57; 61; 63; 65; 145; 171; 181; 366; 450; 519
VAN DAM, H.J. 179; 286; 314; 468; 503; 518
VAN DEN HOUT, M.P.J. 196 (2); 419
VAN DER HORST, P.C. 248
VAN LIESHOUT; R.G.A. 260
VERDIÈRE, R. 239
VEREMANS, J. 150
VERSNEL, H.S. 339
VESEY, D.W.T.C. 476
VETTA, M. 460; 527
VILLE DE MIRMONT, H. DE LA 4 n. 1; 11 n. 38; 12 n. 42; 13 *et* n. 56; 40
VILLENEUVE, F. 407
VINAGRE LOBO, M.A. 262
VITALI, G. 16 *et* n. 65
VOLLMER, F. 240; 304
VON DER MÜLL, P. 460; 527
VOSS, J.H. ix; 5 *et* n. 7; 6; 14; 15; 23 n. 5; 39; 43; 47; 53; 54; 56; 57; 60; 61; 62; 63; 64; 65; 67; 68; 70; 71; 72; 73; 74; 75; 130; 178; 231; 340; 418; 428; 493; 505; 514
VVLPIVS, I.A. 5 *et* nn. 4, 5; 14; 23 n. 4; 39; 48; 55; 57; 59; 60; 61; 62; 63; 64; 65; 66; 67; 68; 69; 70; 71; 72; 73; 107; 109; 136; 138; 143; 229; 263; 264; 265; 267; 272; 274; 308; 340; 358; 372; 389; 420; 430; 434; 435; 455; 466; 470
WAARDENBURG 71; 470
WACKER 71; 470
WACKERNAGEL, J. 468; 518
WAGENER, C. 98; 402
WAGENVOORT, H. 11 *et* n. 41; 256 (2); 281; 287; 354
WAHLÉN, S. 329
WALDE, A. 99; 146; 169; 248; 256; 270; 287; 404; 419; 467
WALTHER 407
WARD-PERKINS, J. 217
WASER, OTTO 418
WASZINK, J.-H. 264
WATSON, P. 111; 142; 318 (2); 512; 513; 520
WATT, W.S. 73; 493
WEINREICH, O. 395
WEINSTOCK, S. 97; 421
WERNICKE, K. 291; 292; 350; 375
WEST, M.L. 401; 402; 444
WHITAKER, R. 375
WIJDEVELD, G. 55; 136
WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, U. VON 198 (2); 501
WILHELM, F. 71
WILKINSON, L.P. 101; 202
WILLIAMS, F. 375
WILLIAMS, F.J. 325; 376; 477
WILLIAMS, G.D. 114 (2); 117
WILLIAMS, G.W. 125; 148 193; 231; 348; 385; 460
WILLIAMS, R.D. 98; 103; 202; 401
WILLIGE, W. 40
WILSON, N.G. 444
WIMMEL, W. 242; 446
WINBOLT, S.E. 202
WISEMAN, T.P. 429 (2)
WISSOWA, G. 146; 168; 248; 256; 270; 345; 379; 420; 429; 430; 467
WISTRAND, E. 223 (2)
WOHL, B. 100; 101
WÖLFFLIN, ED.W. 213; 279; 330; 409; 451
WORMELL, D.E.W. 128
WUNDERLICH, E.C.F. 4 *et* n. 4; 39; 45; 48; 53; 55; 57; 59; 60; 61; 62; 63; 64; 65; 66; 68; 69; 70; 71; 72; 73; 74; 75; 122; 136; 307; 340; 430; 455; 466; 509
YOUNGER, W. 475; 517
ZAGAGI, N. 111; 370
ZIEGLER, K. 182
ZINGERLE, A.R. 8 n. 24
ZOLTOWSKI, J.J. xi

INDEX LOCORVM

A.
Ch. 660–661: 282
Eu. 17–18: 339; 19: 344
Frg. 69.6 R.: 282; 86: 344; 320: 325; 394: 299
Pers. 176 ff.: 265; 301: 233
Pr. 242: 152; 493 ff.: 270; 517–518: 248; 590: 449; 649–650: 449

Acc.
Carm. frg. 8: 471
Trag. 37: 233–234, 487; 169: 275; 183: 438; 209: 345; 223: 487; 235: 492; 241: 341; 241–242: 502; 260: 497; 429: 280; 481: 247; 496: 203; 569–570: 416; 612: 295; 678: 284; 688 R: 469

Ach. Tat.
2.3.3: 462

Aetna *vid.* [Verg.]

Afran.
163: 97, 423; 174: 143; 176: 143; 287–290: 487

[Albinov.]
Liv. 23: 196; 41–42: 196; 52: 228; 65: 151; 69: 179; 73–74: 178; 122: 201; 146: 188; 164: 250; 247: 386; 281–282: 479; 289: 137; 302: 133; 424: 197, 384; 459: 298
Obit. 1.3: 311; 1.6: 252; 33: 518

Alc.
Frg. 38 L.–P.: 460; 41: 527; 304.1: 305; 307.1c: 478; 335: 460; 346: 460; 362: 526; 362.1–2: 527

Alcim.
4.441: 285

Alciphr.
2.3.12–13: 199

Alcvin.
Carm. 42.12 p. 254: 140

Ambr.
Hel. 13: 481
Iob 4.36: 325

[Ambr.]
Trin. (*MGH auct. ant.* 15.381) 12: 439

Amm.
14.11.26: 228; 17.5.3: 136; 20.3.1: 271; 20.11.25: 271; 22.12: 456; 23.6.85: 222; 26.8.13: 228; 29.1.38: 196; 31.1.1: 228

Anacr.
Frg. 10.1–2 P.: 472; 12: 462; 12.1–4: 462; 13: 436; 16 (= 8 D.): 240; 50.1–4: 436; 51 (= 38 G.): 462, 527; 51.1–2: 472; 65: 527; 75: 436; 89: 527; 160d: 527; 27 D.: 460; 43 D.: 460; 43 Bergk: 460; 46 B.: 460; 48 B.: 460

Anacreont.
33.13–16: 371

Anaxil.
Frg. 22.8 ff. K.: 398

Andron.
Carm. 2: 345; 22: 324

Anth. Gr.
2.791 Jacobs: 440

Anth. Lat. (*AL*)
111.9–10 B.: 332; 411.1 R.: 445; 448.2: 133; 455.2: 185; 481.208: 439; 710.3–4: 462; 751: 341; 751.1: 501; 804.13 R.: 439; 914.21 R.: 364; 1109: 210; 1175.1–2: 224; 1175.6: 372

Anth. Pal. (*AP*)
4.1.43: 308; 5–6.3–4: 513; 5.19: 441; 5.30: 230; 5.32: 230; 5.46: 93; 5.50: 230; 5.54.2: 243; 5.57: 369 (369); 5.76.3: 437; 5.93: 462; 5.101: 93; 5.110.2: 472; 5.119: 287; 5.152.3:

287; 5.160.2: 243; 5.166: 287; 5.167: 462; 5.176: 369; 5.176.1–2: 369; 5.177.1: 369; 5.178: 369; 5.179: 369; 5.183: 476; 5.189.1: 515; 5.195.5: 235; 5.199.3–6: 526; 5.200: 526 (2); 5.201.2: 243; 5.204: 302; 5.210.3: 311; 5.279.4: 287; 6.154: 175; 6.279: 305; 6.302: 230; 7.195: 287; 7.196: 287; 7.218: 526; 7.422: 476; 7.562.1–2: 196; 7.737: 190; 8.60: 190; 9.145.5–6: 209; 9.169 ff.: 231; 9.258.2: 518; 9.331: 518; 9.423.4: 239; 9.477: 299; 9.505.11: 299; 9.524.2: 466; 9.525.2: 303; 9.525.5: 299; 9.540: 123; 9.542.15: 304; 9.565: 338; 9.566: 338; 10.12.7: 416; 10.58.1: 209; 11.34.2: 308; 11.49.3: 518; 11.63.2: 484; 11.155.3–4: 514; 11.409.3: 304; 12.5: 312; 12.49: 460, 524; 12.49.3–4: 460; 12.50: 460; 12.50.5: 524; 12.244: 312; 12.52.3–4: 235; 12.90: 230; 12.108: 476; 12.118: 462; 12.120: 462; 12.123: 526; 12.148: 230; 12.155: 93; 12.165: 312; 12.175: 473; 12.205: 441; 12.208: 95; 12.212: 230; 16.227.7: 416

Antip. Sid.
AP 7.218: 526; 12.123: 526

Antip. Thess. *epigrammaticus*
AP 5.30: 230

Ant. Lib.
9: 104; 22.3: 326

Antiphanes *epigrammaticus*
AP 9.258.2: 518

Aphth.
Prog. p. 37.9 ff. Rabe: 302

Apollod.
2.5: 513; 2.3.1: 398; 2.5.12: 398, 400 (2); 2.14.12: 374; 3.10.4: 372
Epit.: 19.15: 372
FGrHist 244 F 98(47) p. 1058 Jacoby: 305

Apollod. Com.
FAC 3 p. 287 Koch: 516

Append. Probi
2.1: 104

Apvl.
Apol. 8.2 Helm: 436; 10.26: 6 n. 18; 23: 425; 41.19 (= 36 p. 477 Oud.): 439; 72: 407; 103: 389
Flor. 3 p. 4.16 Helm: 302, 304, 324–325, 326; 15 p. 20: 329; 17 p. 82: 378; 23 p. 103: 221
Met. 1.6: 167; 1.9: 161; 1.14: 355; 1.19: 255; 2.1: 415; 3.13: 262; 4.6: 255; 4.20: 400; 4.28: 286; 5.15: 328; 5.18: 255; 5.20: 294; 5.22: 306, 314; 5.25: 502; 6.6: 279; 8.7: 489 (1); 8.20: 437; 9.14: 409; 9.30: 370; 9.34: 354; 10.2: 208; 10.18; 207; 10.20.2: 226; 10.21: 526; 10.22: 309; 10.34: 326; 11.14: 163; 11.16: 235
Mundo 35: 182

A.R.
1.628: 213; 1.1334: 411; 2.676–677: 305; 2.708–709: 303; 3.297: 369; 3.744 ff.: 287; 3.1078: 369; 4.357 ff.: 503; 4.445: 369; 4.685: 277

Ar.
Ach. 491: 152
Av. 216: 305; 695: 356
Ec. 972: 134; 975: 371
Frg. 764: 299
Nu. 815: 216
Pax 1333: 235
Pl. 213: 299; 552 ff.: 230; 850–852: 235
Ra. 46: 323; 137–138: 448; 354 ff.: 338; 357: 466; 465 ff.: 400; 1403: 416
Sch. 1215: 220
Th. 319: 467; 988: 469; 991: 341
Vesp. 831: 270

Arat.
Act. 1.988 p. 29: 208; 2.367: 436

Archil.
19.1 W.: 195; 120 W.: 338
22 D.: 240; 63 D.: 417

Arist.
Ath. 10.434–435: 462
Pol. 8.6.5 [1341 a 24]: 377
Pr. 3.11: 462
Rh. 1.5: 226; 2.13.12: 449; 3.19: 389

Aristaenet.
1.10: 230

Aristid.
1.18 Dindorf: 484

Arn.
2.68: 456; 3.21: 342; 4.22: 387; 5.190.2: 429; 7.19: 457 (2); 7.26: 273

Arr.
An. 7.20.2: 181

Artem.
1.5: 262; 2.25: 262; 2.34: 262; 2.69: 262; 4.76: 262

Asclepiades *epigrammaticus*
AP 5.167: 462; 5.189.1: 515; 5.210.3: 311; 12.50: 460; 12.50.5: 524

Athen.
1–10: 475; 1.26c: 475; 11.494 f.: 305; 15.689a: 308

Atta
Tog. 18 ff. R.: 99

Avg.
Civ. 16.30: 186; 22.22: 157
Conf. 8.6.13: 479

Avgvst.
Gest. 5.3–4: 512

Avien.
Arato 35: 356; 210: 145; 399–400: 29 n. 17; 674: 356; 1391: 356; 1551: 356; 1725: 356
Ora 387: 356
Orb. 961: 401; 1142: 405

Avs.
1.120.20v Evelyn White: 173–174
10.12 Peiper: 455; 146.36 (= 195.36 Prete; 1.272.3 Evelyn-White): 408; 157.23: 389; 305.4 (= 144.166 Pr.; 1.322.23v Ev.-W.): 387; 349.16 p. 168 (137 Pr.): 145; 364.44 (= 94 Pr.): 439; 394.2: 479; 399.2: 188; 413.13 (= 216.13 Pr.; 2.90.18v Ev.-W.): 387; 418.65 (= 284.65 Pr.; 2.118.3v Ev.-W.): 383
Carm. 4. *praef.* 17 p. 29: 208; 4.18.11 p. 41; 6.31.5 p. 83: 205
Ep. 14.44 ff. pp. 246–247 Peiper: 302; 29.67: 219
Eph. 3.72: 29 n. 16; 54.1: 29 n. 16; 88.3–4: 29 n. 16
Mos. 84: 285, 400; 153: 486; 266: 431; 403: 188
Par. 22.13: 228
Techn. 3.2: 29 n. 16

Bacchyl.
Epigr. 4.2: 305
Epin. 5.60: 399; 5.60–62: 400
Frg. 9 Crus.: 505; 20.9 B.: 486; 20.13: 221, 484; 21: 195; 21.2: 226

Balb.
in Cic. *Att.* 8.15a.2: 408

Bass.
246.14 K.: 5 n. 8

Bianor *epigrammaticus*
AP 9.423.4: 239

Boeth.
Cons. 2.1: 228; 2.2.29: 228; 3.10.7: 241

Buc. Eins.
1.17: 350; 1.23: 328; 1.35: 342

Caecil.
Com. 262: 450

Caes.
Civ. 1.28.3: 416; 1.51.5: 98; 2.27.2: 237
Gall. 1.26.5: 523; 4.2.5: 517; 4.20.2: 445; 5.14.3: 318; 5.14.5: 317, 318; 7.61.3: 416

[Caes.]
Alex. 13.5: 223
Hisp. 10.1: 233; 15.6: 434

Call.
AP 5.6.3–4: 513; 12.90: 230; 12.118: 462
Ap. 2: 477; 32: 321; 32 ff.: 326; 32–33: 325; 32–35: 325; 35: 320; 38: 306; 39–41: 307; 47: 375; 48: 376; 47–49: 372, 373; 68: 348; 68–69: 339

Del. 9–10: 350; 94: 299; 107: 365; 234: 355; 249–255: 478; 253: 326
Dian. 211: 140
Epigr. 5 Pf.: 246; 5.11: 115; 7: 338; 8: 338; 27.3–4: 516; 29: 518
Frg. 1.17 Pf.: 476; 1.21 Pf.: 260; 2: 259, 260; 75.43–47: 230; 75.49: 369; 80.10: 317; 110.48–50: 149, 150; 191.7–8: 337, 338; 193.17: 230; 302 (= *Hecale* 8 Mair): 292
Iambi 1.7–8: 337, 338; 3.17: 230
Lav. Pall. 25–29: 319
Sch. Florentinum ad Call. *Frg.* 2 Pff.: 259, 260

CALP. SIC.
2.55: 266, 476, 477; 3.10: 364; 3.51: 320; 3.73: 441; 4.60–63: 378; 5.102: 445; 6.9–10: 417–418; 7.12: 329

CAPEL.
1.1: 501; 1.24: 299; 2.116: 210; 2.149: 275; 5.485: 364; 5.512: 403; 5.556: 123; 6.662: 447

CAPIT.
Macr. 3.1: 386

CARM. POP.
PMG 879: 484

CASSIOD.
Chronica Minora, ed. Mommsen, II 130, *MGH*, n° 408, a.u.c. 601 = 153 BC: 99
Var. 5.51.8: 332

CATO
Agr. 21.5: 120; 86: 119; 133.1: 442; 134.4: 270; 141.2: 168
Or. Frg. 61: 434; 174: 193; 182: 237; 185: 193

[CATO]
Dist. 2.3.2 p. 99: 205

CATVL.
1: 93, 117; 1.1: 116; 1.1–2: 113; 1.2: 116, 117; 2.10: 133, 228; 3.5: 140; 3.12: 246; 3.14: 256; 3.18: 512; 4.9: 396; 5: 22; 5.1: 454; 6.8: 184, 308; 6.39–42: 364; 7: 22; 8.3: 232, 478–479, 496; 8.5: 351; 8.8: 232–233, 478–479, 496; 8.16: 353; 9.1: 213; 9.8: 508; 9.11: 233; 10.33: 455; 11.14: 371; 11.21–22: 471; 12.5: 495, 509; 13.4: 311; 14: 93; 14.1: 140; 14.1–7: 334; 14.12: 280; 16.5–6: 334; 17.5: 468 (2); 22: 113; 22.5–8: 113; 22.7: 115, 123; 22.8: 116; 23.7: 116, 335; 23.10: 434, 507; 27: 460; 27.1: 473, 475, 476, 520; 27.1–2: 472; 27.5–7: 488; 29.19: 241; 30.2: 479; 30.4: 507; 30.9–10: 411, 494; 30.10: 412 (2), 495; 31.13: 239; 32: 515; 34.5: 313; 34.5–6: 313, 379; 34.13–14: 276; 34.16: 313 (2); 35: 95; 35.8: 311; 35.16–17: 110; 35.17: 506 (2); 36.11: 286; 37.11: 335; 37.11–14: 350; 37.12: 351; 42.3: 376; 42.9: 210; 42.16–17: 210; 43.6: 353; 44: 237; 45.5: 191; 45.13–16: 468; 45.21–22: 230; 47.2: 284; 47.5: 521; 50: 516; 50.10: 295; 50.14: 371; 50.21: 493; 51.9: 116; 53.5: 280; 55.1–2: 187; 55.13: 370; 58.2–3: 140; 60.1: 404 (2); 60.1–3: 392, 408; 60.2: 402; 61: 236; 61.8–10: 115; 61.9: 467; 61.9–10: 115; 61.21: 315; 61.28–30: 518; 61.54: 352; 61.54–55: 317; 61.61: 231; 61.91: 317; 61.96: 360; 61.117: 205; 61.161–163: 436; 61.191–195: 315, 319; 61.200: 383; 62: 94; 62.7: 290; 62.16: 519; 62.45: 403; 62.50: 481; 62.59 (60): 383; 63.15: 481; 63.16: 396; 63.48: 396; 63.92: 493; 64: 202, 279, 395; 64.7: 286; 64.21: 345; 64.23: 184; 64.31: 234; 64.50: 327; 64.56: 271; 64.57: 504; 64.58: 507; 64.58–59: 503; 64.60: 502, 512; 64.62: 133; 64.63: 305; 64.64: 357; 64.67: 322; 64.69–70: 135; 64.71: 361; 64.72: 133; 64.75: 503; 64.86: 295; 64.95: 133; 64.96: 154; 64.103–104: 137; 64.111: 450; 64.122: 410; 64.123: 507; 64.132 ff.: 502; 64.132–133: 504; 64.132–135: 503; 64.135: 361, 502, 507; 64.136–137: 361, 364; 64.139: 384; 64.142: 412, 495; 64.143–148: 364; 64.146: 386; 64.147: 352; 64.148: 386; 64.154: 404; 64.154–157: 392; 64.154–156: 390; 64.155: 404; 64.156: 252, 396, 396, 407; 64.159: 449; 64.167: 418; 64.172: 503; 64.173: 405; 64.179: 396; 64.183; 64.184: 227; 64.188: 295; 64.192: 428; 64.193–194: 399; 64.206: 284; 64.210: 405; 64.215: 140, 215; 64.221: 154; 64.248: 507; 64.249–250: 502;: 64.250: 133;

64.254: 419; 64.266: 356; 64.290–291: 298; 64.292: 319; 64.301: 335; 64.305–381: 250; 64.307–308: 170; 64.310: 336; 64.312: 251; 64.327: 251; 64.364: 314; 64.374: 352 (2), 360; 64.379: 405; 64.384: 324, 360; 65.2: 342, 506; 65.4: 288; 65.5: 210; 65.5–6: 143; 65.6: 145, 415; 65.10: 140, 410; 65.17: 411; 65.18: 135; 66.1: 284; 66.10: 365, 367; 66.15: 317; 66.20: 317; 66.24–25: 135; 66.40: 512; 66.48: 149; 66.48–50: 149; 66.49: 150; 66.65: 324; 66.70: 418; 66.87: 360; 67: 94; 67.4: 300; 67.18: 383 (2); 67.25: 360; 68.5–6: 287; 68.18: 133; 68.25–26: 135; 68.51: 133; 68.55: 405; 68.67: 128; 68.68: 382; 68.79: 273; 68.83: 515; 68.98: 185; 68.105–106: 154; 68.106: 151; 68.106–107: 140; 68.116: 405; 68.132: 156; 68.133–134: 466–467; 68.136: 382; 68.143: 318; 68.144: 183, 308; 68.147–148: 232; 68.155: 496; 68.156: 382; 68.159: 140, 409 (2); 69.3: 327; 69.8: 353; 70: 513; 70.2–3: 411; 70.3: 351, 352 (2); 70.4: 126; 72.3–4: 351; 73.1: 388; 73.3: 507; 76: 278; 76.6: 507; 76.13–14: 499; 76.19: 278; 76.20: 450; 76.22: 135; 76.23: 133; 76.25: 450; 77.1: 278; 78.4: 353; 82: 140; 86.1: 111, 305, 311; 86.3: 111; 86.5: 111; 87.1–2: 351; 88.2: 515; 90.3: 126; 91.1–2: 156; 96.2: 153; 99.11: 227; 100.2: 191; 100.5–7: 156; 100.7: 451; 100.8: 496; 104.2: 140; 107.3–4: 156; 107.5–6: 516; 107.6: 232 (2), 234; 108.1: 436; 109.3: 280; 109.5: 523; 114.1: 227; 115.3: 240

Cels.
praef. 36: 132; 1.3.14: 487, 526; 2.17.1: 419; 2.18.6: 442; 3.13: 119; 3.18.22: 132; 3.21.6: 419; 3.21.8: 132; 4.10.2: 370; 7.7.11: 251; 7.197: 187

Cels.
Dig. 50.16.96 pr.: 223

Cens.
14.2: 424; 16.1: 10 n. 36; 17.15: 10 n. 36; 18.10: 417; 20.4: 99

Char.
1.87.3 K.: 5 n. 8; 1.126.4: 5 n. 8; 1.145.8: 5 n. 8; 190.13: 5 n. 8; 1.198: 511 p. 131.28 B.: 404; 393.7: 218; 462.8: 156

Cic.
Ac. 2.fr.5: 286; 2.61: 447; 2.108: 370; 4.2: 121; 4.16: 300
Am. 37: 481; 90: 479; 96: 481
Amer. 23: 209; 57: 97; 147: 209
Arat. 118: 213
Att. 1.1.4: 353; 1.8.1: 381 (2); 1.12.3: 430 (2); 1.13.3: 430; 2.3: 237; 2.12.4: 136; 2.15b: 121; 2.24.4: 158; 3.5: 455; 3.10.3: 228; 5.16.2: 158; 7.2.3: 213; 8.15a.2: 408; 9.5.3: 134; 9.13.8; 11.12.2: 481; 12.12.2: 275; 12.21.5: 157; 16.2.1: 126
Brut. 30: 120; 287: 475
Caec. 31: 300
Cael. 9: 360; 36: 277
Carm. frg. 12: 353; 41.6 B. (= 42.6 Bue.): 247
Cat. 1.22: 435; 1.27: 140; 3.12.29: 200; 3.18: 385
Clu. 31: 432
Com. 21: 490
Cons. frg. 2.34 M.: 239
De or. 2.131: 203; 2.193: 376; 2.285: 361; 3.42.168: 200; 3.85: 490; 3.137: 288; 3.153: 340 (2); 3.163: 403; 3.167: 176; 3.201: 120
Div. 1.12: 269; 1.16: 270; 1.23: 480; 1.29: 269, 345; 1.39–70: 261; 1.131: 270; 2.26: 269; 2.28: 270; 2.32: 270; 2.46: 331; 2.48: 480; 2.52: 271; 2.58–71: 261; 2.93: 417; 2.115: 332; 2.119 ff.: 265; 2.121: 480; 2.128: 359; 2.146: 275
Domo 45: 498 (2); 76: 166; 105: 430; 134: 336; 144: 280
Ep. 4.13.2: 151; 6.6.12: 481; 10.3.4: 481; 11.2.2: 387; 12.17.3: 134; 13.50.1: 134
Fam. 4.8.2: 300; 5.13: 134; 7.12.2: 512; 7.14: 135; 7.33.2: 108, 237; 10.32.1: 212; 12.25.6: 4 n. 3; 14.3.3: 243; 14.7.1: 140
Fat. 28: 455
Fin. 1.12: 135; 2.10: 508; 2.31: 441; 2.37: 336; 3.48: 291; 5.64: 376; 5.91: 441

Flac. 5: 481; 21: 209; 28: 242; 66: 137; 92: 481
Glor. frg. 12: 404
Har. resp. 23: 336; 26: 360; 37: 428, 430 (2); 38: 430; 58: 481
Inv. 1.94: 362
Leg. 1.22: 336; 1.51: 336; 2.2: 220, 221; 2.19: 336; 2.21: 336, 430; 2.22.56: 162; 2.23.58: 164; 2.45: 359; 2.59: 173; 2.60: 170; 2.64: 173; 3.9: 336
Luc. 61: 447
Marc. 11: 481
Mil. 8: 376; 20: 165; 23: 490; 42: 376; 89: 238; 98: 233
Mur. 88: 266
Nat. 1.4: 435; 1.45: 359; 1.52: 336; 1.83: 286; 2.1: 517; 2.57: 328; 2.62: 336; 2.64: 280; 2.66: 146; 2.68: 276 (2), 277; 2.100; 2.166: 275; 3.54: 104; 3.71: 435
Off. 1.16: 336; 1.17: 359; 1.19: 359; 1.44: 329; 1.71: 227; 2.13: 206; 3.39: 376
Or. 22: 450; 140: 247; 157: 97
Par. 6.3: 220; 13: 199; 49: 220, 221
Phil. 2.7: 498; 2.66: 212; 2.67: 403; 3.18: 491; 4.9: 266; 8.9: 262; 9.3: 187; 10.20: 508; 11.3: 435
Pis. 22: 228; 46: 434; 52: 200; 57: 381; 61: 247; 96: 98
Planc. 22: 348; 80: 184
Poem. frg. 41: 401
Pomp. 32: 200; 35: 264
Quinct. 29: 238; 63: 333; 79: 279
Quint. 1.3.3: 152; 2.10.4: 526
Quir. 19
Rab. Post. 39: 209
Rep. 1.23: 311; 1.48: 336; 1.56: 336; 1.59: 361; 2.48: 336; 6.12: 451
Sen. 4: 378; 36: 157
Senect. 22: 160; 59: 336; 61: 188; 62: 437; 71: 440
Sest. 1: 165; 89: 157; 93: 212
Somn. Sc. 1: 134
Sull. 44: 108; 88: 140
Tim. 33: 336; 43: 344; 52: 285
Tull. 34: 200
Tusc. 1.10: 252 (2), 401, 444; 1.30: 167; 1.116: 332; 2.39: 126; 3.56: 490; 3.59: 279; 4.72: 522; 4.76: 365; 4.77: 435; 5.62: 220
Vat. 13: 509
Verr. 1.22: 294; 1.45: 212; 1.47: 387; 1.56: 389; 1.62: 300; 1.91: 212; 2.3.191: 490; 2.3.152: 490; 2.3.297: 490; 2.4.93: 434; 2.4.128: 501; 3.135: 306; 3.182: 376; 4.25: 200; 4.26: 135; 4.103; 5.28: 480; 5.146: 403 (2); 5.169: 294; 5.184: 457; 6.30: 177; 6.80: 177; 6.150: 405

CIL
1.593 (= Dessau 6085.61): 160; 1.1214: 423; 1.1930: 178; 1.2231: 457; 1.2289; 1.2290; 2.1413: 342; 3.8.21: 184; 3.10347.1: 250; 3.11229.5: 250; 4.1520: 369; 5.1706: 250; 5.5343: 342; 5.5737.7: 447; 5.7237: 510; 6.1454: 423; 6.10234.3: 359; 6.18817.8: 441; 6.21521: 252; 6.25890: 208; 6.27278: 423; 6.30114: 210, 249; 6.30119: 423; 6.36658: 247; 10.1935 (= Dessau 7841d): 170; 10.4993: 456; 11.944: 510; 11.1122: 295; 11.1420: 174; 11.5357: 249; 11.5667: 423; 11.8082: 51013.2104.7: 178; 13.3983: 242; 13.6808: 303; 14.2852: 187

CINNA
Frg. 11.1–2 B. (= *FPL* p. 89 M.): 113, 516

CIRIS *vid.* [VERG.]

CLAVD.
Bell. Goth. 632 ff.: 228
Carm. 1.51: 241; 1.247: 471; 3.24: 104; 3.102: 241; 5.325: 356; 15.213–214: 289; 17.287: 241; 26.171: 252; 27.6: 356; 28.27: 129; 28.506: 456; 29.71: 241
Carm. in Ruf. 1.120: 255
Carm. min. 25.41: 318; 25.92: 360; 27.55: 305; 29.51: 368; 31.61: 104; 31.126: 320
De III cons. Honorii 211: 182
Pros. (= 32–36) praef. 1–12: 149; 1.20–21: 145; 1.272: 317, 318; 1.276: 282; 1.276–277: 285; 2.81: 182; 2.136: 387; 2.255 ff.: 425; 2.255–256: 154; 2.295: 396; 3.15: 330; 3.133: 412 (2); 3.237: 431

Clavd. donat.
Aen. 7.314: 455

CLE
14.2: 171; 29.10: 475; 52.8: 139; 55.1–2: 178; 55.7: 423; 78.1: 151; 112.10: 188; 186.4: 455; 211: 190 (2); 237: 190; 245.1–2: 454; 250.14: 386; 270.3: 184; 271.2: 303; 280.1: 486; 317.3: 190; 332: 328; 354: 369; 363: 190; 367.1: 423; 373.1: 454; 373.3: 185; 377.1: 247; 385: 190; 386.4: 344; 387: 190; 389.2: 423; 400.3: 423; 423: 139; 423.2: 151; 425: 190; 430: 190; 434.15: 178; 442: 190; 445: 190; 446.2 p. 209: 205; 420.20: 247; 422.2: 422, 445; 443: 477; 443.5: 249; 447.4: 423; 447.6: 454; 456.4: 249; 458: 190; 461: 190; 462: 190; 463: 190; 472: 190; 473.3: 246; 475.4: 247; 480: 190; 490.6: 247; 493.8: 249; 494.2: 249; 495: 190; 508: 190; 509.2: 439; 520: 190; 542.1: 168; 542.7: 242; 543: 196; 543.9: 171; 544.4: 247; 544B.6: 295; 548: 190; 553: 190; 555: 190; 556: 190; 558: 190; 560: 190; 563.5: 423; 575: 190; 586: 190; 592(593).5: 188; 596: 190; 634.3: 257; 646: 190; 661.1: 29 n. 18; 679: 190; 687: 190; 688: 190; 701.3: 29 n. 18; 720 p. 342: 205; 732: 190; 753: 190; 766: 190; 786: 190; 794: 190; 802.2: 454; 803.2: 454; 804.1: 454; 805.1: 454; 820.1: 250; 842.1: 247; 856.3: 247; 856.13: 297; 857: 190, 454; 859: 454; 859.1: 454; 889.2: 188; 931: 475; 960.5–6: 243; 965.7: 242; 989.4: 423; 990.9: 188; 998.1: 242; 1004.3: 454; 1011.5: 249, 250; 1017.3: 188; 1021.1: 344; 1021.4: 247; 1023: 190; 1034.3: 168; 1038.5: 186; 1041.4: 151; 1041.8: 246; 1058.3: 247; 1066.3: 246; 1069.4: 342; 1081.1: 454; 1082.1: 454; 1091.3: 454; 1095.9: 454; 1109: 261; 1109.1: 151; 1109.7–9: 264; 1109.14: 377; 1109.21: 261; 1109.22: 261; 1109.24: 261; 1111.20: 247; 1117.5: 454; 1120.2: 423; 1120.4: 162, 163; 1128.6: 422; 1141.11: 423; 1141.16: 250, 385; 1144.8: 185, 247; 1149.3: 170; 1150.3: 455; 1161.4: 422; 1166: 190; 1168.9: 423; 1175: 30 n. 19; 1179: 190; 1189.10: 423; 1191.4: 188; 1196.2: 295; 1202.6: 257; 1212.5–6: 444; 1219.1: 247; 1237.14: 247; 1247.1: 171; 1248: 190; 1260.1: 151, 190; 1289.6: 257; 1295.3: 423; 1296.1: 205; 1299.1: 454; 1301.3: 422; 1313: 190; 1314.3: 423; 1320: 190; 1322: 190; 1347: 190; 1351: 190; 1357.1: 188; 1372: 190; 1378: 190; 1398.2: 479; 1411: 190; 1430.3: 158; 1431.13: 454; 1432.3: 423; 1504.11: 246; 1523.4: 249; 1523.11: 454; 1530A.8: 344; 1533.11: 454; 1552A.2: 342; 1556.5: 257; 1581.9: 257; 1636.21: 247; 1645: 190; 1685.7: 247; 1758: 190; 1786d.1: 247; 1818: 190; 1834.3: 242; 1836: 190; 1849 p. 850: 205; 1884.1: 423; 1943.5: 208; 1967.7: 208; 1979.1: 242; 1982.5: 423; 1988.4: 422; 1993.1: 247; 2010: 151; 2023.1: 454; 2039.1: 419; 2075.1: 247; 2075.1–2: 252, 439; 2102.1: 208; 2107B.4: 424; 2288.4: 171; 2296.14: 249 (2)

Col.
Arb. 19.1: 442
Rust. 2.9.10: 399; 3.13.13: 207; 4.19.3: 451; 4.24.12: 204; 5.1.5: 202–203; 5.1.8: 203; 6.171: 431; 7.10.4: 294; 7.10.5: 399; 9.14.14: 163; 10.156: 291; 10.175: 316, 319, 320; 10.271: 210; 10.288–289: 311; 10.289: 314; 10.309: 526; 10.361: 165; 10.430: 501; 12.28.3: 524; 12.38.4: 524; 12.59.5: 437

Comica Adespota Fragmenta (CAF)
118.4 Kock: 497

Commod.
Instr. 1.35.16 p. 29: 205

Corip.
Ioh. 3.456: 356; 7.15: 356
Iust. 2.72–73: 311; 3.1: 199

Crinag.
AP 5.119: 287

Cvlex *vid.* [Verg.]

CVRT.
3.3.18: 321; 3.11.9: 208; 4.4.11: 200; 4.7.24: 471; 4.10.6: 435; 5.6.5: 327; 5.8.1: 208; 5.9.4: 435; 6.5.27: 328; 7.2.24: 313; 8.3.14: 359; 8.5.8: 501; 8.9.19: 222; 8.13.22: 411; 9.3.5: 360; 9.7.12: 225

CYPR. GALL.
Ex. 351: 356
Num. 281–284: 264

DAR.
13 p. 16.12: 309

D.C.
37.35.4: 430; 48.51: 419; 55.8.5: 173; 56.31.3: 173

D.CHR.
78.31: 238

DEMETR.
Rhet. Gr. 3.270.28 ff. Spengel: 183

DEMOCR.
Frg. 21: 338; 30: 484

DIODOR.
3.59.2–5: 377; 4.5.1: 501

DIOM.
1.314.35 K.: 5 n. 8; 1.484.17: 5 n. 8

DION. *epigrammaticus*
AP 12.108: 476

DIONYS.
5.17: 173

DIOSCORIDES *epigrammaticus*
AP 5.54.2: 243

DIOSCORIDES *medicus*
1.7.1: 308

DIOTIMVS *epicus* p. 213 *Frg.* 1 Kinkel: 374

DIPH.
Frg. 61: 220

DOM.-MARS.
Epigr. Tib.: 6 n. 18

DONAT.
Aen. 3.135 p. 284.6 Georgii: 223; 9.580 p. 263.4: 226; 10.515 p. 359.14: 439

DRACONT.
Laud. 3.592: 499
Orest. 813: 431
Romul. 2.112: 318; 8.152: 386; 9.215: 140; 10.587: 341

D.S.
2.49: 182; 3.46: 182; 3.59.5–6: 326; 4.25–26: 400; 5.75.3: 326

E.
Alc. 1–14: 372; 8: 375; 74: 422; 449: 325; 843–844: 356
Andr. 1267: 518
Ba. 1 ff.: 340; 100: 466; 235: 307; 553: 325; 581: 341; 625: 518; 773: 461; 988–991: 392; 990: 392, 404; 1017: 466
El. 464–465: 478
Frg. 330.6–7 N.: 497; 765: 469
Hec. 71: 356
Hel. 148 ff.: 347; 569–570: 276
Heracl. 21–25: 400
HF 23–24: 217; 101–102: 497; 351: 330; 611: 398, 399; 683: 325; 1377: 340
Hipp. 407: 363; 530–533: 449; 766: 450; 1013 ff.: 240
Hypsipyle 3(1).11–12: 250–251
Io. 94 ff.: 128; 621 ff.: 240; 1150: 282; 1150: 356; 1150–1151: 283 (2)
IT 42 ff.: 265; 1237: 305
Or. 146: 377; 1001: 478; 1239: 174, 179
Med. 8: 368; 21 ff.: 503; 492: 503; 911: 411; 1341–1343: 392; 1342: 404; 1358–1359: 392
Phaeton frg. 781.11–13 Nauck (224–225 Diggle): 291–292
Supp. 975–976: 305; 1155: 411
Tr. 253–254: 305; 419: 411; 454: 411

EMP.
68B 132 Diels-Kranz: 235

ENN.
Ann. 5–6 V. (= 2–3 Sk.): 299; 16 (= *op. inc. frg.* 2 Sk.): 445; 50: 365; 64: 243, 244; 143: 286; 175: 345; 183–184: 152; 192: 345; 207: 280; 225: 396; 395 (= 386 Sk.): 485; 291: 339; 323: 452; 352: 313; 377: 155; 385: 286; 405: 103; 414: 156; 448 (= 521 Sk.): 485; 491: 280; 613: 336; 620: 200; 625: 409
Frg. 6 V.: 260
Sat. 8: 227; 50: 493
Scen. 10 V.: 127; 25: 156; 31: 303; 43: 332; 94–96 (89–91 J.): 220; 109: 145; 112 (97 J.): 283; 112–113 (96–97 J.): 282, 283; 123: 501; 123–124: 175; 124 (= 121 J.): 469; 139 (152 J.): 152, 252, 452; 209: 289; 213: 519; 245 (192 J.): 145; 254: 288, 368 (2); 260: 493; 314: 431; 348: 438; 355: 324; 392: 288; 415 (404 R.²): 398
Var. 11: 478; 19: 190; 26: 246; 46: 458; 78: 146, 254
ap. Non. p. 232.24: 126

ENNOD.
1.1.37: 104
CSEL 6 p. 432.1: 385
Dict. 2.5: 385

EPIGR. GR. (EG)
345.3–4 Kaibel: 444; 575.6: 440

EPITALAMIUM LAVRENTI PLM 3.42.33–55 Bae.: 315

EPITAPH. NAEV.: 145

EPITAPH. VERG.: 30

[ERATOSTH.]
Catast. 24 (= p. 140 Rob.): 292

ETYM. MAG.
571.17: 175

EVENVS *epigrammaticus*
AP 11.49.3 (= 2.3 D.): 518 (2)

EVHEMERVS
FGrHist 63: 181

EVPH.
AP 6.279: 305
Frg. 43 Powell (= *frg.* 47 van Groningen): 144; 251

EVR.
HF 883: 198
Med. 1123: 198; 1279: 152
Supp. 902: 198
Frg. 902N²: 235

EVSEB.
Chr. Proem. I. I: 374
Praep. Evang. 4.9.2: 457

EVSTATHIVS AFER
8.7 p. 953³: 400

EVSTATHIVS THESSALONICENSIS *episcopus*
Il. 23.151: 305; 580.21: 107

FAB.-MAX.
4: 423

FASTI PRAEN.: 96

FEST.
p. 141 M.: 273; 150: 99; 162: 278: 423; 279; 236: 173; 348.19 ff. (= 474.31 ff. L.): 458
p. 424 L.: 219; p. 256 L.: 219
p. 324.28 Th.: 519

FLOR.
Epit. 1.11.4: 457; 1.16.4: 419; 1.46.2: 435

FORT.
Carm. 1.17.1 p. 21: 140; 4.24.11 p. 94: 208; 8.3.235: 356; 8.6.4 p. 193: 140

FRACASTORIVS *Carm.* 2.12: 374

FRONTIN.
Aq. 7: 520; 67: 520; 91.5: 520; 99.4: 12 n. 41
Strat. 2.7.13: 458

FRONTO
4.5–8 Van den Hout: 419; 218.8–9 V. d. Hout (= 229.18 Naber): 356; 222.25–26 V. d. Hout (1954 B) = 238.7–8 V. d.

Hout (1988 T): 196; 228.26 ff. N.: 401

FVLG.
Myth. 2.1 p. 40: 245; 2.12 p. 53.8: 467

GAI.
Inst. 3.195: 433

GALEN.
14.630 ff. K.: 287

GALL.
Frg. 1 *FPR* p. 360 B. (= *FPL* p. 99 M.): 201

GELL.
1.24.2: 145; 2.26: 285; 3.16.10: 247; 4.18.3: 435; 5.6.20: 308; 10.28: 423; 13.11.1: 342; 13.23.2: 107; 15.7.3: 10 n. 36

GESTA BERENG.
3.13 p. 384: 153

GRATT.
315–316: 239

GREG. NAZ.
Or. 14(16).17: 304

GREG. TVR.
Franc. 6.22: 132; 9.38: 132

GV
350 Peek: 190; 394: 190; 971.3–4: 444

HDT.
1.91: 248; 1.93.1: 238; 1.178: 183; 1.185: 183; 2.32.2: 407; 3.106.1: 216; 3.107: 309; 3.107 ff.: 182; 4.28.1: 406; 4.28.2: 406; 5.101.2: 239

HEDYLVS *epigrammaticus*
AP 5.199.3–6: 526

HELIOD.
1.15.4: 243

HERO
Aut. 26.3: 123

HERODIAN.
4.2.3: 173

HES.
ap. Apollod. 2.5: 513
Op. 1: 129; 167 ff.: 446; 614: 486; 643: 428
Sc. 203: 325; 206: 104
Th. 22–34: 260; 53: 129; 54: 104; 211: 288, 447; 310–312: 400; 311: 398, 399 (2); 311–312: 401; 312: 399; 319–325: 397; 767–773: 400; 768: 428; 769–773: 444; 771–773: 399; 788: 285; 788–794: 252; 796: 422

HIER.
Ep. 3.4.3: 479; 14.6: 215; 14.6.2: 403; 66.1–2: 393, 404; 125.2: 403
Is. 13.13 p. 242: 196
Os. 6.54: 145
Ruf. 1.30: 144

H. HOM.
31.14: 177
h. Ap. 17: 349; 25 ff.: 349; 32–42: 302; 134: 303; 184–185: 331; 185: 330; 396: 299; 449–450: 303
h. Merc. 24–61: 326; 25: 325; 33: 325; 153: 325; 471–472: 344
h. Ven. 2: 243; 89: 310

HISTORIA COMPOSTELLANA (= *CORP. CHRIST. CONT. MED.* LXX)
1.1.1: 403; 2.10: 403

HOM.
Il. 1.1: 103; 1.167: 103; 1.603: 293, 325; 2.1–2: 287; 2.1–71: 289; 2.6: 265; 2.8: 265; 2.71: 288; 2.484: 103; 2.594–600: 105; 2.763–767: 376; 3.5: 285; 4.141–149: 314; 4.510: 152; 5.53–54: 195; 5.330: 243; 5.458: 243; 6.181: 397, 398; 6.345 ff.: 411; 8.69 ff.: 248; 8.366 ff.: 400; 8.368: 399, 400; 9.65: 167; 9.158: 444; 9.202: 525; 9.378–391: 148; 9.457: 422, 428 (2); 10.1–4: 287; 11.218: 103; 11.218–219: 104; 13.569: 272; 14.245–246: 285; 14.315: 351; 14.508: 103; 15.37–38: 253; 15.189: 443; 15.191: 443 (2); 15.187–193: 443; 16.33–35: 391;

16.34: 396; 16.112: 103; 16.434: 248; 16.441–442: 248; 18.107: 363; 20.39: 303; 20.127–128: 248; 22.26–31: 417; 22.31: 272; 23.250: 173; 23.252: 162; 23.252–253: 170; 22.357: 395; 23.595: 134; 24.205: 395; 24.209–210: 248; 24.607–608: 434; 24.793: 162; 24.793–794: 170.
Od. 1.1: 103; 3.236 ff.: 248; 4.561–569: 446 (2); 4.563: 445; 4.563–568: 446 (2); 5.61–62: 250; 5.185–186: 253; 5.306–307: 235; 6.154–159: 235; 7.81–132: 231; 7.196–198: 248; 8.388 ff.: 231; 8.408: 411; 9.94: 444; 10.42: 475; 10.221–222: 250; 10.491: 422, 428; 10.513–514: 251; 11.14–19: 447; 11.23–50: 456; 11.156–159: 251; 11.373–374: 497; 11.395: 475; 11.427: 360; 11.456: 360; 11.623: 400; 11.623–625: 399, 400; 11.630: 503; 11.639: 285; 12.73: 402; 12.85–100: 402; 12.132 ff.: 107; 12.245 ff.: 402; 12.308 ff.: 497; 12.311: 497; 13.372: 469; 16.73: 359; 19.163: 392; 19.535–562: 259; 20.5–6: 287; 20.54–58: 287; 21.295: 461; 23.172: 395; 24.11: 285; 24.72: 162, 170

Homer. Lat.
Ilias 31: 349; 111: 284; 316: 326; 723: 144; 736: 208; 875: 407; 891: 399

Honestvs *epigrammaticus*
AP 5.19: 441

Hor.
Ep. 1.1.14: 512; 1.1.20–21: 515; 1.1.83: 420; 1.2.47 ff.: 228; 1.2.49: 126; 1.4: 5 n. 8, 16; 1.4.3: 7; 1.6.17–18: 225; 1.6.65–66: 199; 1.7.4: 341; 1.7.12: 479; 1.7.17–19: 477; 1.7.36: 183; 1.7.71: 523; 1.10.12: 126; 1.10.22: 216, 218; 1.10.22–23: 219; 1.10.23: 294; 1.10.26: 225; 1.13.11: 479; 1.13.18: 198; 1.14.6: 495; 1.14.34: 524; 1.15.18: 474; 1.15.18 ff.: 482; 1.15.19: 484; 1.15.39: 186; 1.16.20: 387; 1.16.30: 471; 1.16.52: 157; 417; 1.17.1: 495; 1.17.25: 155; 1.17.28: 188; 1.18.5: 359; 1.18.28: 157; 1.18.59: 495; 1.18.73: 199; 1.18.74: 473; 1.18.105: 448; 1.19.1 ff.: 339; 1.19.9: 488; 1.20: 95; 1.20.1–2: 113, 118; 2.1.5: 501; 2.1.16: 511; 2.1.21–22: 208; 2.1.26: 175; 2.1.46: 441; 2.1.80: 383; 2.1.89: 116; 2.1.110: 297; 2.1.134–135: 198; 2.1.142: 141; 2.1.186: 335; 2.1.199: 418; 2.1.240: 387; 2.1.260: 418; 2.2.4: 311; 2.2.15: 328; 2.2.46: 116; 2.2.55: 355; 2.2.76: 524; 2.2.80: 505; 2.2.168: 495; 2.2.176: 416; 2.2.181: 224, 226
Epod. 1.25–26: 212, 214; 2.1: 235; 2.28: 304; 2.39: 362; 2.70: 97; 3.9: 311; 5.14: 384; 5.22: 181; 5.38: 432; 5.83–84: 384; 5.93: 161; 7.5–10: 195; 7.15: 318; 8.3–10: 302; 9.12: 362; 9.14: 448; 9.30: 238; 9.33–36: 472; 9.37–38: 175; 10.18: 237; 11.8–10: 522; 11.11–12: 230; 11.16: 411; 11.27: 311; 12.1: 362; 12.10: 312; 12.11: 312; 12.21: 224, 226 (2); 12.24: 362; 13.3–4: 479; 13.15–16: 247; 14.1–4: 144; 14.6: 335; 14.7–8: 123; 15.3: 280 (3), 493; 15.4: 512; 15.6: 454; 15.9: 303; 15.10: 134; 15.20: 239; 15.23: 21 n. 1; 16.19–20: 408; 16.35–36: 236; 16.41–42: 446; 16.48: 418; 17.45: 335; 17.80: 432
Od. 1.1: 148; 1.1.1: 213; 1.1.6: 340; 1.1.11: 203, 213; 1.1.11–12: 212; 1.1.13: 246; 1.1.29: 506; 1.1.29–30: 470; 1.2.2: 345; 1.2.26: 354; 1.2.30: 467; 1.2.30–32: 312; 1.2.32: 339, 349; 1.2.51: 480; 1.2.109–110: 450; 1.3.1: 468; 1.3.1 ff.: 468; 1.3.1–2: 468; 1.3.9: 395; 1.3.9 ff.: 153; 1.3.9–24: 149; 1.3.10: 396; 1.3.12: 149; 1.4.1: 420; 1.4.9: 526; 1.4.10: 420; 1.4.11: 219; 1.4.13: 145, 255, 443; 1.4.13–14: 421; 1.4.16: 169, 253; 1.4.17: 145; 1.4.18: 480; 1.4.27: 360; 1.5.9: 243; 1.5.10: 411; 1.5.10–11: 411; 1.7.1–14: 148; 1.7.15–18: 497; 1.7.19: 481; 1.7.22: 175; 1.7.28: 347; 1.7.28–29: 387; 1.9.13: 425; 1.10.5: 280; 1.12.11: 329; 1.12.35: 383; 1.12.48: 310; 1.13.2: 306; 1.13.17–20: 235; 1.15.14: 362;

1.15.17: 503; 1.17.13–14: 333, 335; 1.17.17: 417; 1.17.19: 371; 1.17.22: 341; 1.18.1: 469; 1.18.3: 335, 488; 1.18.4: 460; 1.18.5: 484; 1.18.6: 501; 1.18.7: 481, 486; 1.18.11: 466; 1.19.1: 369; 1.19.2: 340, 341; 1.19.5: 325; 1.19.15: 458, 471; 1.21.2: 303, 350; 1.21.11: 521; 1.21.13–16: 492; 1.22.5: 407 (3); 1.23.3–4: 277; 1.24.15–18: 444; 1.24.16–18: 211; 1.24.18: 253; 1.24.19: 155; 1.25.7: 191; 1.25.7–8: 515; 1.26.1 ff.: 344; 1.26.1–3: 411, 412; 1.26.6–9: 129; 1.26.9: 231; 1.27: 395; 1.27.4: 481; 1.27.7: 479; 1.27.9: 475; 1.27.12: 191; 1.27.19: 395, 403; 1.27.23–24: 395, 398; 1.28: 94; 1.28.4–6: 195; 1.28.10: 256; 1.28.11–13: 495; 1.28.17: 487; 1.28.19–20: 422; 1.28.23: 383; 1.28.25: 491; 1.29.1: 183; 1.29.8: 304; 1.30: 464; 1.31.2: 471; 1.31.2–3: 474; 1.31.3 ff.: 195; 1.31.18: 379; 1.32.4–5: 330; 1.32.10: 505; 1.32.13–14: 325; 1.32.15: 333; 1.32.16: 336; 1.33: 5 n. 8, 16; 1.33.2: 16, 381, 382; 1.33.2–3: 16; 1.33.3: 357; 1.33.6: 449; 1.34.10: 217; 1.33.10 ff.: 369; 1.34.14–16: 228; 1.35: 229; 1.35.22: 480; 1.36.10: 232, 233; 1.36.15–16: 527; 1.36.15–16: 525 (2); 1.37.4: 479; 1.37.7: 494; 1.37.28: 430; 1.37.32: 362; 1.38: 472; 1.38.1: 473; 2.3.12: 418; 2.3.13–16: 460; 2.3.15–16: 249 (2), 253; 2.3.17–28: 209; 2.3.21–25: 211; 2.3.24: 256, 444; 2.3.28: 209; 2.4.3: 311; 2.4.22: 425; 2.5.9–12: 320; 2.5.10: 382, 441; 2.5.10–12: 320; 2.5.17–18: 351; 2.5.18: 325; 2.5.18–28: 310; 2.5.23: 304; 2.5.31: 141; 2.6: 205; 2.6.3: 407 (2); 2.6.5–6: 206; 2.6.22–24: 179; 2.6.23: 163, 174; 2.7.7–8: 308, 525; 2.7.8: 308, 526; 2.7.19: 299; 2.7.21–25: 525; 2.7.25–26: 480; 2.7.46: 141; 2.9.1–2: 497; 2.9.13: 411; 2.9.17–18: 383; 2.11.10–11: 310; 2.11.13 ff.: 525; 2.11.13–14: 460; 2.11.16: 183, 308, 526; 2.11.16–17: 308; 2.11.18: 473; 2.11.18–20: 472, 519; 2.11.19: 475 (2); 2.11.22: 326; 2.12.5: 489; 2.12.8: 201; 2.12.17–20: 110; 2.12.20: 188; 2.12.21 ff.: 240; 2.12.21–28: 230; 2.12.22: 181; 2.12.24: 183; 2.13.5: 391; 2.13.21: 422; 2.13.23: 446; 2.13.33–36: 400; 2.13.34: 399; 2.14.6–7: 444; 2.14.8–9: 249; 2.14.9: 211; 2.14.17: 255; 2.14.17–18: 253, 254; 2.14.18: 252; 2.14.21: 209; 2.14.21–28: 209; 2.14.26–27: 474; 2.15: 193; 2.15.1: 202; 2.15.16: 215; 2.16: 229; 2.16.9–12: 227; 2.16.15–16: 509; 2.16.35–36: 224, 226; 2.16.35–37: 224; 2.16.36: 226; 2.17: 237; 2.17.13: 398; 2.18: 193; 2.18.1: 195; 2.18.1–2: 221; 2.18.1–5: 214 (2), 220; 2.18.4: 216 (2); 2.18.6: 215; 2.18.8–9: 224, 226; 2.18.10: 230; 2.18.19–20: 223; 2.18.30: 254, 256; 2.18.34: 256; 2.18.38: 211; 2.19: 463; 2.19.1–2: 338; 2.19.7–8: 442; 2.19.9–16: 338; 2.19.29: 466; 2.19.31–32: 401; 2.20.5–6: 154; 2.20.8: 211; 2.20.10: 161, 478; 2.20.15: 407; 3.1: 193; 3.1.37 ff.: 228; 3.1.41: 216, 217; 3.2.6: 294; 3.2.26: 430; 3.2.26–27: 428; 3.3.1: 479; 3.3.6: 281 (2); 3.3.13: 501; 3.3.13–14: 485; 3.3.20: 362; 3.3.33–34: 201; 3.4.18–19: 298; 3.4.31: 371; 3.4.46: 249; 3.4.61: 128; 3.4.61–62: 309; 3.4.62: 303; 3.4.64: 387; 3.4.65: 157; 3.4.74–75: 255 (2); 3.4.75: 256; 3.4.79: 213; 3.5.44: 487;: 3.6.1: 423; 3.6.28: 205; 3.6.39: 203; 3.7.7–8: 287; 3.7.13: 362; 3.7.25–28: 495; 3.8.1: 96; 3.8.6–7: 456; 3.8.26: 424; 3.9: 94; 3.9.1: 230; 3.9.2–3: 306; 3.9.13–14: 133; 3.9.24: 204 (2); 3.10.5–6: 218, 219; 3.10.10: 228; 3.10.11–12: 394; 3.11.3: 325; 3.11.15–20: 400; 3.11.17–18: 399 (2); 3.11.18: 398; 3.11.20: 401; 3.11.22: 378; 3.11.29: 256; 3.11.51: 185; 3.11.51–52: 184 (2); 3.13.9–10: 417; 3.13.10: 411; 3.13.15: 518; 3.14.5: 362; 3.14.17–18: 472; 3.14.18: 184; 3.14.21–22: 309; 3.15.2: 290; 3.16.19: 200; 3.16.33 ff.; 3.17.13: 175; 3.18.13–16: 495; 3.19.20: 328; 3.19.23: 494; 3.19.28: 451; 3.21.2: 488; 3.21.3: 157; 3.21.11:

449; 3.21.15–16: 488; 3.21.18: 484; 3.21.24: 292; 3.23.17–20: 198; 3.23.19: 237; 3.23.19–20: 272, 273, 274; 3.24: 193; 3.24.1–2: 183; 3.24.9: 406; 3.24.18: 362; 3.24.59–60: 510; 3.25: 338, 463; 3.25.1–3: 338; 3.25.10: 294; 3.25.14–15: 518; 3.25.19: 501; 3.27.13: 496; 3.27.13–14: 455; 3.27.38–42: 271; 3.27.40–42: 357; 3.27.50: 256; 3.28.12: 349; 3.28.15: 478; 3.29.1–5: 474; 3.29.3–4: 525; 3.29.43: 454; 3.29.60: 246; 3.30.15–16: 299; 4.1.2: 443; 4.1.8: 197; 4.1.10: 478; 4.1.29: 362; 4.1.37: 357; 4.2.15–16: 397; 4.2.24: 256; 4.2.33: 331; 4.3.1–12: 148; 4.3.14: 411; 4.3.17–18: 325; 4.4.33: 116; 4.5.10: 396; 4.5.17: 125; 4.5.21: 360; 4.5.23: 341; 4.5.25: 406; 4.5.34: 471; 4.5.39: 487; 4.6.3: 493; 4.6.22: 345; 4.6.26: 304; 4.6.28: 305; 4.6.37: 336, 379; 4.6.42: 234; 4.7.27–28: 210; 4.8.1: 471; 4.8.11–12: 112; 4.8.20: 104; 4.9.4: 377; 4.9.35: 337; 4.11.34: 362; 4.11.34–35: 377; 4.12.14: 175; 4.13.13: 324; 4.13.23: 247; 4.14.9: 335; 4.14.46: 337; 4.15.13 ff.: 442; 4.15.26: 486; 4.15.25: 234; 4.15.26: 488; 4.15.27: 341; 4.15.28: 336

Poet. 4: 362; 12: 382; 34: 331; 53: 418; 75–76: 329; 85: 133, 175; 105–107: 514; 158: 377; 173–174: 449; 181: 154; 195: 479; 214: 337; 291: 117; 295–298: 338; 328: 171; 332: 113; 348–349: 376; 355: 495; 365: 522; 366–367: 495; 395: 197, 325, 384; 428–429: 308; 444: 337

Saec. 1: 292; 9: 292; 13: 336; 25: 385; 61: 339, 349

Sat. 1.1.24: 157; 1.1.41: 212; 1.1.110: 466; 1.1.118: 208; 1.2.36: 107; 1.2.68: 389, 390; 1.2.70: 107; 1.2.99: 322; 1.2.101–102: 324; 1.2.130: 362; 1.3.74–75: 157; 1.3.87: 97; 1.3.129: 495; 1.3.133: 441; 1.3.139: 479; 1.4.43–44: 331; 1.5.42: 410; 1.5.51–54: 95, 104; 1.6.17: 126; 1.6.52–53: 388; 1.6.54: 125; 1.6.63: 280; 1.6.116: 473; 1.6.118: 471; 1.6.124: 441; 1.7.10: 125; 1.7.25–26: 417; 1.7.33–34: 280; 1.8.29: 168; 1.9.24: 452; 1.9.28: 185; 1.9.63: 441; 1.9.64: 454; 1.9.72–73: 479; 1.10.31: 260; 1.10.31–33: 264; 1.10.32–33: 300; 1.10.33: 282; 1.10.58: 120; 1.10.92: 523, 524; 2.1.2: 126; 2.1.58: 356; 2.2.1: 490; 2.2.15–16: 475; 2.2.29: 495; 2.2.70: 490; 2.2.88: 438; 2.2.123: 481; 2.3.20: 335; 2.3.31–32: 383; 2.3.41: 335; 2.3.115: 475; 2.3.135: 494; 2.3.184: 209; 2.3.208: 387; 2.3.233: 346; 2.3.274: 175; 2.3.284: 125; 2.3.302: 335; 2.4.24–25: 475; 2.4.24–26: 475; 2.4.84: 225; 2.5.15: 495; 2.5.17: 381; 2.5.37: 376; 2.5.39: 417; 2.5.49: 256; 2.5.58: 386; 2.5.60: 125, 281; 2.5.70: 362; 2.6.52: 126; 2.6.69: 481; 2.6.78: 335; 2.7.7: 479; 2.7.8: 280; 2.7.37: 125; 2.7.65: 362; 2.7.90: 362; 2.7.108: 381; 3.107: 107

HOST.
Frg. 4 M.: 313

HSCH.
s.v. Sappho: 331; E 4089 s.v. ἐπαινή: 428

HYG.
Fab. 9: 303; 33.2: 143; 50: 372; 79.2: 217; 79.3: 401; 171: 250; 191: 239; 203: 298

ICV
63A: 190; 2.590: 190; 1129: 190; 1911: 190; 3366: 242; 3436.3: 242; 3885A.1: 242; 4921: 242

ICVR
2.4209: 423; 7.19742.3: 158

IG
1.2(9).210: 299; 12.5.46: 337; 12.9.287: 190; 14.769: 440

ILCV
400: 249; 2211.1: 247; 2211.1–2: 252, 439; 3484: 423; 4753.3: 158; 4805: 423

ILIAS vid. HOMER. LAT.

ILLRP
803: 423; 805: 171

ILS
139.21–22: 174; 5213: 423; 6261: 139; 7460: 171; 7589: 455; 8132: 423

Inc. Trag.
132: 356

Iren.
4.39.2: 486; 941.47–48: 486

Isid.
Nat. 4.2: 100
Orig. 3.70.14: 417; 3.71.2: 277; 5.38.4: 345; 6.11.4: 115; 10.151: 172; 11.2.3: 171; 12.6.10; 15.15.5: 203; 16.1.6: 232; 17.6.6–7: 219; 20.3.7: 458

Javol.
Dig. 32.100.4: 326

Jvlianvs *epigrammaticus*
AP 7.562.1–2: 196

Jvst.
12.16.2: 302; 14.4.12: 417; 18.6.5: 252; 27.2: 121

Jvv.
Sat. 1.27: 225; 2.41: 307 (2); 2.89: 477; 2.98: 510; 3.26–28: 439; 3.30: 233; 3.49: 402; 3.54–55: 241; 3.88: 306; 3.122–123: 308; 3.163: 526; 3.210: 209; 3.232: 470; 4.16–17: 452; 4.34: 95; 4.36: 104; 4.113: 431; 4.147: 487; 5.61: 473; 5.63: 517, 520; 6.382: 331; 6.463: 307; 6.466: 181; 6.522: 273; 6.628–629: 507; 7.3: 188; 7.8 ff.: 231; 7.23: 115; 7.35: 209; 7.49: 203; 7.54: 154; 7.178: 215; 7.182: 215, 216, 217; 7.211: 402; 8.29: 36 n. 26; 8.65: 162; 9.32: 229; 9.53: 96; 9.60: 202; 9.95: 431; 10.72–74: 228; 10.118: 116; 10.129: 435; 10.345: 306; 11.13: 377; 11.28: 184; 11.94–95: 326; 11.146: 473; 12.3: 456; 12.65: 251; 13.232: 457; 14.44: 477; 14.211: 357; 14.298: 241; 14.298–299: 239; 14.308: 326; 14.397: 215; 15.131; 15.131–132: 486; 16.33: 157

Jvvenc.
2.451 *CSEL* 24 p. 62: 199

Laber.
4: 294

Lact.
Inst. 1.22.9: 429
Mort. 39: 173
Phoen.: 180; 15 *CSEL* 27 p. 136: 439

Lavs Pis.
13.5: 521; 120: 360; 159: 236; 175: 330; 219: 212

Leonidas *epigrammaticus*
AP 6.154: 175; 6.302: 320; 7.422: 476

Lex Tab.
10.1 Bruns: 164

Liv.
praef. 11: 230; 1.1.8: 432; 1.8.1: 335; 1.15.8: 409; 1.16.7: 488; 1.34.11: 200; 1.55.8: 391; 1.58.3: 271; 1.58.4: 509; 1.58.8: 288; 2.21.4: 490; 2.42.10: 288; 2.48.2: 100; 2.52.6: 100; 2.61.9: 441; 3.2.9: 383; 3.6.1: 99; 3.6.2: 100; 3.7.5: 234; 3.31.2: 342; 3.32.2: 201; 4.52.8: 500; 5.7.3: 327; 5.21.8: 270; 5.22.8: 247; 5.36.6: 247; 5.42.6: 233; 6.12.8: 345; 6.33.5: 433; 7.35.11: 294; 8.6.5: 345, 354; 8.39.4: 196; 9.1.11: 435; 10.23: 318; 10.31.11: 384; 10.35.14: 411; 10.42.7: 411; 21.30.5: 284; 21.41.16: 359; 21.53.2: 288; 22.10.6: 423; 22.10.10: 332; 22.15.6: 134; 22.50.4: 294; 23.9.2: 127; 24.7.11: 330; 24.26.10: 237, 238; 24.31.3: 458; 24.40.3: 167; 24.45.9: 212; 25.38.3: 288; 25.40.2: 328; 26.13.13: 429; 26.19.4: 269; 27.37.7: 451; 27.50.5: 354; 28.25.3–4: 175; 28.30.11: 229; 29.19.13: 134; 30.2.13: 332; 34.32.20: 425; 34.37.6: 134; 34.52.5: 327; 36.17.8: 317; 38.33.11: 237, 238; 38.45: 238; 39.49.2: 191; 40.56.9:

162; 41.16: 419; 42.28.2: 237; 44.22.16: 335; 45.22.2: 105; 45.32.6: 422

LONGUS PASTOR. I p. 22 Schaef.: 316

LVC.
Carm. 8(9): 243
Civ. 1.2: 505; 1.17: 420; 1.18: 406; 1.63 ff.: 353; 1.64–65: 338; 1.77–78: 283; 1.114: 247; 1.141: 442; 1.222: 453; 1.252: 183; 1.287: 298; 1.456: 145; 1.472: 435; 1.556: 385; 1.568: 185; 1.609: 176; 2.39: 153; 2.55: 183; 2.82: 344; 2.220: 286; 2.329: 521; 2.361: 115; 2.375: 437; 2.525: 208; 2.544: 455; 2.641: 255; 3.38: 266; 3.209–210: 239, 240; 3.217: 226; 3.353: 141; 4.66: 183; 4.119: 255; 4.170: 200; 4.186: 331; 4.219; 4.247: 495; 4.352: 183; 4.403: 116; 4.481: 208; 5.2: 458; 5.11: 200; 5.15: 401; 5.48: 103; 5.51: 206; 5.70: 202, 349; 5.71: 183; 5.77: 344; 5.98–99: 435; 5.113–114: 98; 5.125: 128; 5.151: 386; 5.158: 156; 5.198–199: 345; 5.214–215: 318; 5.221–222: 144; 5.262: 103; 5.274–275: 437; 5.402: 431; 5.435: 255; 5.442: 255; 5.463–464: 191; 5.484–485: 407; 5.492: 383; 5.494: 197; 5.497: 236; 5.515: 216; 5.616: 498; 5.628: 443; 5.666: 495; 5.739–740: 140, 158; 5.744: 425; 5.811: 517; 6.52: 183; 6.310: 162; 6.325: 406; 6.420: 341; 6.616: 442; 6.621: 331; 6.648: 217; 6.662: 448; 6.685: 210; 6.703: 250; 6.715: 257; 6.725: 344; 6.761: 331; 6.768–770: 144; 6.773: 443; 6.806: 434; 7.22: 272; 7.371–372: 437; 7.540: 443; 7.555: 363; 7.609: 436; 7.659: 424; 7.755: 241; 7.769: 432; 7.787: 172; 7.837: 307; 8.232: 487; 8.261: 436; 8.392: 405; 8.520: 247; 8.793: 190; 9.1 ff.: 446; 9.36: 217; 9.87: 422; 9.201: 360; 9.233: 208; 9.303: 407; 9.440: 407; 9.577: 385; 9.1043: 453; 10.30: 247; 10.88: 249; 10.103 ff.: 497; 10.112–113: 221; 10.120–121: 326; 10.366: 111; 10.370: 127; 10.395: 424; 10.408: 417; 10.477: 407

LVCIAN.
Cat. 20: 209; 28: 400
DDeor. 17: 294
Dmort. 20(10).1: 209; 24(30).1: 398
Hipp. 5: 216
Ind. 7: 115, 123; 16: 123
Merc. Cond. 41: 113, 115, 123
Nec. 14: 398, 400
Sat. 4: 480
VH 2.19.25 ff.: 446

[LVCIAN.]
Am. 3: 243; 16: 480; 114: 302
Cyn. 9: 221

LVCIF.
Parc. 19 p. 251.26: 132

LVCIL.
2 M.: 210; 19–22 (= 23–26 K.): 345; 21: 501; 264: 118; 282 (= 287 K.; 7.12 Charpin): 389; 342: 126; 430 (= 438 K.): 448; 557 (= 560 K.): 448; 559: 388; 621: 505; 653: 269; 730: 382; 802: 431; 1131: 474

LVCILLIVS *epigrammaticus*
AP 11.155.3–4: 514

LVCR.
1.8: 396; 1.22: 231; 1.23: 410; 1.79: 196; 1.115: 252, 256; 1.116: 252; 1.117: 505; 1.141: 371; 1.213: 371; 1.269: 349; 1.352: 265; 1.413: 484; 1.414: 438; 1.495: 336; 1.569: 458; 1.713: 170; 1.771: 170; 1.778: 284; 1.778–779: 126; 1.790: 171; 1.815: 458; 1.849: 371; 1.922–923: 338; 1.946: 104 (2); 1.1052: 425; 1.1084: 170; 2.2: 371; 2.12: 371; 2.20 ff.: 193; 2.24 ff.: 195; 2.26 ff.: 214; 2.28: 220, 221; 2.54: 371; 2.223: 458; 2.365: 228; 2.417: 181, 182; 2.591: 203; 2.656: 175; 2.660: 505; 2.705: 397; 2.730: 371; 2.772: 396; 2.781: 396; 2.848: 308; 2.970: 371; 2.1160: 371; 2.1163: 371; 2.1165: 371; 3.52: 457; 3.52–53: 456–457; 3.62: 371; 3.117: 452; 3.176: 371; 3.221: 175; 3.234: 458; 3.276–277: 458; 3.366: 371; 3.403: 495; 3.415:

495; 3.419: 371; 3.486: 343; 3.507: 371; 3.614: 228; 3.683: 197; 3.695: 319; 3.705: 495; 3.710: 207; 3.730: 371; 3.737: 371; 3.871: 179; 3.878: 163; 3.943: 371; 3.954: 135; 3.987: 153; 3.999: 370, 371; 3.1011: 253; 3.1030: 344; 3.1042: 207; 3.1054: 208; 4.1: 104; 4.40: 295; 4.42: 161; 4.57: 319; 4.137: 284; 4.310: 458; 4.318: 300; 4.386: 424; 4.426: 495; 4.604: 335; 4.685: 430; 4.722: 349; 4.764: 265; 4.791: 522; 4.826: 294; 4.958: 371; 4.981–982: 328; 4.1099: 371; 4.1105–1106: 243; 4.1106: 205; 4.1121: 371 (1); 4.1160: 312; 4.1196: 205; 4.1205: 205; 5.62: 270, 357; 5.213: 371; 5.327: 505; 5.405: 505; 5.481: 286; 5.575: 313; 5.681: 233; 5.869: 371; 5.892: 402, 403; 5.901: 485; 5.903–906: 397; 5.905–906: 397; 5.996: 256; 5.1008: 451; 5.1182: 371; 5.1214: 371; 5.1215; 5.1248: 212; 5.1272: 371; 5.1299: 371; 5.1359: 371; 5.1377: 442; 5.1399: 299; 5.1430: 371; 6.6: 349; 6.51: 271; 6.159: 458; 6.396: 371; 6.440: 396; 6.628: 396; 6.653: 479; 6.691: 397; 6.762: 256; 6.797: 451; 6.819: 431; 6.1076: 203; 6.1091: 431; 6.1092: 400; 6.1127: 198; 6.1138: 431; 6.1178: 418, 518; 6.1221: 451; 6.1227: 344; 6.1227–1228: 343; 5.1244

Lycophr.
Alex. 272: 239; 1472–1473: 411

Macedonivs *epigrammaticus*
AP 11.63.2: 484

Macr.
Sat. 1.12.21: 429 (2); 1.12.21 ff.: 429; 1.12.23: 430; 1.12.24–25: 429; 1.12.27: 429; 1.15.5: 99; 1.15.9 ff.: 99; 1.17.32: 387; 1.18: 339; 1.19.3: 502; 2.8.2–3: 342; 2.12: 102; 3.3.2: 219; 5.22.11 ff.: 344; 7.6.8: 462; 7.12.7: 524; 7.12.9: 475 (2)
Somn. 1.3: 259, 263 (2), 265; 1.3.6: 287; 1.11.2: 145; 1.20.8: 284; 2.11.12: 284

Maecen.
Frg. 2 M.: 195; 3.1–2: 140

Manil.
1.22: 505; 1.56: 228, 344; 1.458: 365; 1.727: 495; 1.848: 284; 2.49: 342; 2.149: 344; 2.642: 344; 3.144: 431; 3.194: 356; 3.560: 208; 4.14: 229 (2); 4.110: 431; 4.358: 171; 4.390 ff.: 344; 4.577: 513; 4.721: 312; 5.3: 283; 5.16: 212; 5.60: 356; 5.326: 332; 5.330–331: 328; 5.332: 331; 5.404: 223; 5.423: 453; 5.554: 306; 5.568: 236

Marcell. Emp.
Med. 32: 246

Marcian.
Dig. 39.4.16.7: 177

Marc. Arg. *epigrammaticus*
AP. 5.32: 230; 5.110.2: 472

Mart.
1 *praef.* 1: 116; 1.3: 95, 116; 1.3.2: 116; 1.3.12: 524; 1.10.4: 513–514; 1.11.3: 520; 1.11.3–4: 517; 1.13.1: 139; 1.17.16: 118; 1.18.1: 475; 1.27.1: 264; 1.31: 305; 1.41.8: 473; 1.42.6: 524; 1.49.15: 241; 1.55.14: 312; 1.59.1: 419; 1.61.1: 505; 1.62.3: 419; 1.62.5: 419; 1.64.1: 353; 1.64.4: 353; 1.66.10: 117; 1.66.11: 115; 1.66.12: 123; 1.70: 95; 1.70.15: 342, 506; 1.72.6: 312; 1.77: 131; 1.77.1 ff.: 274; 1.78.4: 445, 448; 1.82.10: 334; 1.86.5: 243; 1.88.6: 174; 1.88.9: 250; 1.93.2: 446; 1.96.6–7: 225; 1.96.14: 134; 1.101.2: 234; 1.104.22: 402; 1.106: 462; 1.106.7: 522; 1.107: 462; 1.108: 95; 1.115: 312; 1.115.2: 320; 1.117.16: 113, 115, 117; 2.1: 95; 2.4.3: 141; 2.6.10–11: 123; 2.22.1: 249–250; 2.29.5: 307; 2.41.11: 312; 2.41.11: 312; 2.41.12: 312; 2.41.16: 521; 2.46.9: 441; 2.47.2: 245; 2.57.2: 225; 2.57.5: 304; 2.75.6: 203; 2.87.1: 353; 3.2: 95; 3.2.7–11: 113; 3.2.9: 123, 124; 3.2.10: 115; 3.2.11: 121; 3.4: 95; 3.5; 95; 3.20: 94, 95; 3.20.1: 95, 104; 3.53: 302; 3.58.30–31: 304; 3.65.6: 183; 3.65.8: 525; 3.68: 266; 3.93.26: 317; 4.6: 5 n. 8; 4.8.9–10: 281; 4.10.1–2: 113;

4.14.1: 129; 4.30.4–5: 281; 4.33.4: 170; 4.37.8: 126; 4.45.5–8: 465; 4.45.7: 297; 4.45.7–8: 304; 4.57: 414, 420; 4.57.1: 415; 4.57.1–3: 414; 4.57.7: 414; 4.57.7–8: 418; 4.62: 312; 4.73.5: 208; 4.73.6: 249; 4.78.3: 102; 4.82.4: 237; 4.82.6: 481, 519; 4.86: 95; 4.89: 95; 4.89.1–2: 123; 5.2.7–8: 319; 5.6.14–15: 123; 5.8: 225; 5.20.1–2: 241, 355; 5.23: 225; 5.25.6: 445, 448; 5.37.3: 223; 5.37.4: 223; 5.37.6: 320; 5.41.6: 118; 5.61.9: 312; 5.78.14: 506; 5.84.10–12: 96; 5.93.2: 445; 6.1.5: 281; 6.11: 225; 6.11.7: 181; 6.12.2: 514; 6.29.6: 303; 6.40.4: 388; 6.42.1: 415; 6.42.6: 415; 6.42.7: 415, 417; 6.42.11 ff.: 216; 6.42.11–13: 217; 6.43: 414; 6.43.1–2: 453; 6.43.2: 518; 6.43.8: 279; 6.45.1: 107; 6.58.7: 249; 6.58.7–8: 248, 251; 6.59.2: 213; 6.64.7: 331; 6.86.5: 240, 241; 6.92.2: 471; 6.93.2: 116; 6.93.9: 312; 7.13: 312; 7.22.4: 129; 7.25.5: 441; 7.29.8: 312; 7.30.4: 222; 7.40.5: 441 (2); 7.47.1: 188; 7.53.12: 212; 7.54.1–8: 273; 7.54.2: 434; 7.69.10: 506; 7.84: 95; 7.88.7: 241; 7.93.7–8: 468; 7.96.4: 249; 7.96.7: 210; 7.97: 95; 7.99.7: 505; 8.1: 95; 8.3: 94, 95; 8.3.2: 104; 8.3.17: 489; 8.6.14: 471; 8.10: 224; 8.28.14: 222, 223; 8.33.11: 221; 8.33.17: 312; 8.39.1: 521; 8.44.11: 97; 8.45.2: 232; 8.50.23–26: 462; 8.52.3: 402; 8.55(56).14: 475, 476; 8.57.5: 170; 8.59.11: 441; 8.61.4: 123; 8.67.1: 473; 8.68.4: 486; 8.68.7–8: 324; 8.70: 5 n. 8; 8.72: 95; 8.72.1: 113, 115, 130, 226; 8.72.1–2: 117, 118; 8.73.7: 5 n. 8, 26; 8.73.8: 505; 8.75.11: 137; 8.77.3: 183; 8.77.5: 475 (2); 8.78.5–6: 240; 8.81.1: 469; 9 *praef.* 5–6: 378; 9.2.6: 431; 9.2.9: 223; 9.7.4: 509; 9.12(13).5: 223; 9.12.15: 222; 9.16.6: 304; 9.18.8: 129; 9.22.8: 475; 9.28.9: 299; 9.29.1: 207; 9.29.2: 144, 254; 9.37.9: 213; 9.42: 336; 9.42.3: 342, 506; 9.42.11: 336; 9.44.2: 331; 9.49.4: 200; 9.52.4–5: 232, 234; 9.75.6–9: 216, 218; 9.75.7–9: 215; 9.90.5: 475; 9.90.15: 96, 98; 9.93.1: 472, 475, 519, 525; 9.93.7: 452; 9.94.1: 470; 9.99: 95; 9.101.17: 484; 10.12.7: 523; 10.13.5–6: 479; 10.12.7–12: 312; 10.13.5–6: 410; 10.13(20).9: 30 n. 20, 133; 10.14(13).9: 522; 10.16.4: 241; 10.17(16).5: 223; 10.18.1: 441; 10.20(19): 94, 95; 10.26.4: 162; 10.26.6: 179; 10.37.2: 346, 349; 10.38.4–5: 232; 10.47.10: 521; 10.50.5: 441; 10.58.5–6: 342; 10.71.5: 521; 10.93.3–4: 115; 10.96.3: 241; 10.96.13: 524; 10.98.1: 520, 525; 10.104: 95; 10.104.3: 238; 11.1: 95; 11.1.1–2: 113, 130; 11.2: 115; 11.6: 207; 11.6.6: 266, 476, 477; 11.6.12: 462; 11.8.1: 307; 11.8.7: 475 (2); 11.8.12: 473; 11.11.3: 520; 11.15.5: 526; 11.20.7: 140; 11.26: 473; 11.26.3: 475; 11.27.5: 205; 11.32.4: 380; 11.32.8: 230; 11.33.3: 524; 11.35.1: 213; 11.36: 237; 11.36.1: 233; 11.36.1–2: 232; 11.36.2: 237, 348; 11.36.4–5: 250; 11.36.5: 475; 11.36.5–6: 520; 11.39.9: 522; 11.39.11: 225 (2), 307; 11.40.11: 225; 11.49(50).7: 475; 11.54.1–3: 180; 11.65.1: 213; 11.72.2: 402; 11.78.4: 473; 11.80.1: 419; 11.80.1–2: 420; 11.96.1: 520; 11.107.1: 123, 124; 11.178.5: 352; 12.2: 95; 12.3.3: 241; 12.11: 94; 12.11.1: 135, 136; 12.11.6: 135; 12.21: 141; 12.32.25: 102; 12.34.5–7: 232; 12.49.3: 402; 12.54: 437; 12.57.22: 320; 12.60.8: 524; 12.68.4: 104; 12.98.6: 355; 13.100.2: 223; 13.108: 475; 13.115: 474; 13.119.1: 176; 14.14: 480; 14.54.1: 509; 14.54.2: 328; 14.84: 115, 118; 14.100.1: 505; 14.152.1: 505; 14.156: 224; 14.157.1: 173; 14.162.1: 441; 14.169.1: 328; 14.170.2: 472, 525; 14.183–196: 93; 14. 193: 5 n. 8, 26, 30

Mar.-Vict.
127.7 K.: 5 n. 8

Maxim.
3: 153; 5.17: 332; 5.120: 431

MEL.
AP 4.1.43: 308; 5.57: 369 (2); 5.160.2: 243; 5.174.2: 356; 5.176: 369; 5.176.1–2: 369; 5.177.1 (369); 5.178: 369; 5.179: 369; 5.204: 302; 7.196: 287; 12.49: 460, 524; 12.52.3–4: 235; 12.165: 312

MELA
1.7: 407; 3.8: 241; 3.79: 182; 3.81: 181

MEN.
Frg. 315 Koch: 233
Pc. 214: 134

MEN. RH.
334.25–336.4: 464; 414.16–19: 444; 421.16–17: 444

MGH
Poet. 5 p. 427 nr. 7.3: 140

MIN. FEL.
3.3: 322

MORET. *vid.* [VERG.]

MOSCH.
1: 375; 1 ff.: 282; 2.5: 264; 4.9: 140; 27: 411

[MOSCH.]
3.111 ff.: 430

MVSAE.
18: 133; 19: 449; 55–66: 302; 106: 369; 232–233: 287; 314: 416

MVSON.
Frg. 19 p. 108 H.: 216; 20 p. 108: 221

NAEV.
Ep. 24(25).1: 196
Frg. 1: 249
Pall. 3: 227; 122: 175

NEMES.
Ecl. 1.5: 339; 1.19: 208; 1.20: 207; 1.45: 208; 2.28: 471; 2.70: 374; 3.18: 469; 3.36: 466; 4.60: 289

NEP.
Alc. 4.3: 430; 8.1: 163
Att. 12.2–4: 12
Epam. 4.1: 212; 4.2: 231, 241
Frg. 24 P.: 215
Thr. 4.4: 342

NICOL.
Prog. p. 69.12 ff. Felten: 302

NON.
p. 43 M.: 230; 134.7 (= 194 L.): 404; 232.24: 126; 337.33.: 454; 405: 289; 542: 173; 549: 173; 549.30: 173; 550.1: 173

NONN.
D. 5.411: 356; 5.487–488: 311; 9.169–179: 483; 10.321–325: 374; 13.82: 299; 15.49: 304; 16.172: 304; 18.168: 304; 38.122 ff.: 311; 44–46: 491; 47.389: 503

NVX
64: 203, 204; 69: 382; 147: 196; 159: 158 (2); 163: 450

OPP.
C. 1.365: 299

OPTAT.-PORPH.
Carm. 3.17: 387

ORIENT.
Comm. 2.353: 205
ORPH. ARG.
1014: 356

ORPH. HYMN.
34.3.5: 292; 34.3.8: 292; 64.6: 518; 87.9: 444

OV.
Am. epigr. 1: 116; 1.1.5: 368; 1.1.6: 104; 1.1.11: 304; 1.1.11–12: 326; 1.1.20: 165; 1.2.1–4: 287; 1.2.3: 515; 1.2.6: 481; 1.2.8: 369; 1.2.18: 372; 1.2.47–48: 485; 1.2.50: 424 (2), 425; 1.3.3: 361; 1.3.4: 128; 1.3.5: 372; 1.3.7 ff.: 195; 1.3.9: 202, 203 (2); 1.3.9–10: 231; 1.3.11: 333, 337; 1.3.11–12: 338; 1.3.14: 317; 1.3.15: 213; 1.3.16: 133, 334; 1.3.17–18: 204 (2); 1.3.18: 250; 1.4.3–4: 513; 1.4.7:

311; 1.4.11–12: 412; 1.4.12: 411; 1.4.20: 188; 1.4.22: 317; 1.4.38: 197; 1.4.52: 525; 1.4.59: 507; 1.4.61: 165; 1.4.64: 482; 1.5.1 ff.: 515; 1.5.9: 330; 1.5.11: 111; 1.5.13–14: 324; 1.5.19–22: 302; 1.5.23: 303; 1.5.25: 515; 1.6.7–8: 484; 1.6.9: 266; 1.6.17: 382; 1.6.24: 355; 1.6.27: 151, 451 (2); 1.6.33: 166; 1.6.33–34: 155; 1.6.34: 368; 1.6.38: 526 (2); 1.6.43: 411; 1.6.52: 411, 499; 1.6.54: 467; 1.6.56: 473; 1.6.59–60: 462; 1.7.3–4: 169; 1.7.15: 503; 1.7.16: 411; 1.7.19: 494; 1.7.35: 524;: 1.7.40: 311, 437; 1.7.63: 383 (3); 1.8: 363; 1.8.12: 311; 1.8.18: 213; 1.8.19: 429; 1.8.21: 507; 1.8.31: 474; 1.8.35: 314, 317; 1.8.35–36: 319; 1.8.43: 111; 1.8.59: 321 (2); 1.8.60: 325; 1.8.85–86: 513; 1.8.95: 242; 1.8.106: 411; 1.8.107–108: 207; 1.8.112: 448; 1.9.1–28: 370; 1.9.6: 352 (2), 353 (2); 1.9.22: 154; 1.9.39: 493; 1.9.43: 133, 191, 334; 1.10.2: 142; 1.10.14: 437; 1.10.15: 209; 1.10.29: 362; 1.10.33: 133, 487; 1.10.47–48: 509; 1.10.55–56: 440; 1.10.56: 205; 1.10.59–60: 357; 1.10.60–61: 112; 1.10.61: 226; 1.10.64: 388; 1.11.5: 330, 383; 1.11.6: 371; 1.11.9–10: 395; 1.11.11: 493; 1.11.14: 169; 1.11.24: 330; 1.11.25: 299; 1.12.22: 384; 1.12.29: 439; 1.13.10: 421; 1.13.17: 440, 441; 1.13.19: 380; 1.13.40: 282–283; 1.14.6: 177; 1.14.11: 473; 1.14.13: 213; 1.14.14: 358; 1.14.31–32: 304 (2); 1.14.33: 375; 1.14.36: 169; 1.14.38: 527; 1.14.39: 437; 1.15: 6 n. 18; 1.15.14: 495; 1.15.18: 353; 1.15.34: 204, 241; 1.15.35: 227, 305, 309; 1.15.36: 128, 129 (2); 1.15.38: 289; 1.15.42: 170; 2.1.1–2: 379; 2.1.3: 266; 2.1.19–20: 513; 2.1.22: 383; 2.1.23: 310; 2.1.24: 478; 2.1.28: 495; 2.1.34: 330; 2.2.20: 330; 2.2.21–22: 451; 2.2.24: 478; 2.2.28: 418; 2.2.63–64: 155; 2.2.64: 426; 2.2.64–65: 431; 2.2.64–66: 426; 2.2.64–65: 426; 2.2.65: 426; 2.2.66: 384; 2.3.1: 499; 2.3.2: 205; 2.3.3–4: 149; 2.3.4: 527; 2.3.38: 310; 2.4.10: 213; 2.4.11–12: 317; 2.4.15: 220; 2.4.17: 506; 2.4.17–18: 506; 2.4.41: 306; 2.5.7: 389; 2.5.26: 352 (2); 2.5.34–42: 315; 2.5.35: 142; 2.5.35 ff.: 314; 2.5.36: 317; 2.5.41–42: 317; 2.5.53: 358; 2.5.59: 153; 2.5.60: 495; 2.6.12: 408; 2.6.39: 169; 2.6.43: 244; 2.6.43–44: 411; 2.6.49–50: 446; 2.6.56: 352; 2.6.60: 188; 2.6.61–62: 189; 2.8.1: 213; 2.8.5: 205; 2.8.18: 281, 490; 2.8.19–20: 411, 412; 2.8.20: 412; 2.9.1 ff.: 369; 2.9.2: 390; 2.9.11: 493; 2.9.12: 169; 2.9B(10).46: 243; 2.10.3: 347; 2.10.12: 133, 289, 334; 2.10.19: 368; 2.10.30: 187; 2.11.4: 200; 2.11.1–6: 149; 2.11.13: 223; 2.11.18: 402; 2.11.18–20: 407; 2.11.30: 235; 2.11.33: 411; 2.11.37: 455; 2.11.49: 175; 2.11.55–56: 479; 2.12.1: 298; 2.12.13: 481; 2.12.16: 467; 2.12.25: 142; 2.12.25–26: 375; 2.13: 237; 2.13.26: 365; 2.14.5: 149; 2.14.23: 440, 441; 2.14.23–24: 436, 439, 440 (2); 2.14.24: 169, 442; 2.14.25: 440; 2.14.28: 440; 2.14.30: 380; 2.14.38–39: 416; 2.14.41: 411; 2.16.3–4: 417; 2.16.19–32: 370; 2.16.21–26: 407; 2.16.41: 519; 2.16.43–46: 510; 2.16.46: 411; 2.16.47: 133; 2.17.5: 450; 2.17.24: 514; 2.17.27: 331; 2.18.10: 213; 2.18.15: 323; 2.18.16: 169; 2.18.29: 311; 2.19.1–2: 388; 2.19.11: 361; 2.19.13: 361; 2.19.21–22: 516; 2.19.34: 507; 2.19.37: 242; 2.19.43: 133; 2.19.44: 482; 2.19.55: 522 (2); 2.19.59: 155; 3.1.1–2: 218; 3.1.7: 526; 3.1.7–14: 302; 3.1.12: 323; 3.1.16: 390; 3.1.17: 481, 521; 3.1.20: 369; 3.1.23: 338; 3.1.32: 120; 3.1.41: 334; 3.2.39: 450; 3.2.39–40: 451; 3.2.46: 467 (2); 3.3.3–10: 302; 3.3.3–6: 301; 3.3.4: 493; 3.3.5: 311; 3.3.5–6: 314; 3.3.6: 314; 3.3.9–14: 510; 3.3.10: 510; 3.3.11: 265, 513; 3.3.23: 278; 3.3.29: 453; 3.3.41–42: 196;

3.3.44: 499; 3.4.3: 139; 3.4.5: 360; 3.4.6: 388; 3.4.23: 495; 3.4.37: 142; 3.5: 259; 3.5.1: 295; 3.5.16: 142; 3.5.40: 363; 3.6.28: 21 n. 1; 3.6.36: 169; 3.6.47: 495; 3.6.58: 170; 3.6.59: 152; 3.6.65: 383; 3.6.71: 170; 3.7.7–8: 508; 3.7.8: 311; 3.7.14: 479; 3.7.19: 361; 3.7.21: 198; 3.7.25: 451; 3.7.63: 205; 3.7.80: 330, 358; 3.8: 148; 3.8.22: 170; 3.8.23: 379; 3.8.50: 444; 3.9: 5 n. 8, 26, 159; 3.9.4: 361; 3.9.10: 170; 3.9.12: 331; 3.9.17: 333, 334; 3.9.21: 195; 3.9.31 ff.: 6; 3.9.32: 133, 334; 3.9.51: 166; 3.9.52: 165; 3.9.62: 505; 3.10.3: 299; 3.10.19–20: 416; 3.11.1: 155; 3.11.6: 484; 3.11.9–12: 372; 3.11.21: 509; 3.11.29: 299; 3.11.35: 369; 3.11.48: 510; 3.12.1–2: 478; 3.12.5–6: 106; 3.12.17: 435; 3.12.21–22: 402; 3.12.26: 400, 401; 3.12.43: 227; 3.13.1: 142; 3.13.4: 188; 3.13.5–6: 495; 3.13.7–8: 218; 3.13.13: 375, 456; 3.13.25–26: 226; 3.14.13: 220; 3.14.14: 495; 3.14.24: 213; 3.14.36: 383; 3.14.50: 511; 3.15.12: 202; 3.15.16: 442; 3.15.17: 338; 466

Ars 1.9: 369; 1.12: 485; 1.14: 175; 1.30: 386; 1.31: 266; 1.61: 441; 1.63: 213; 1.67: 365–366; 1.97: 188; 1.101: 149; 1.110: 388; 1.127: 480; 1.137: 332; 1.170: 197; 1.185: 156; 1.229–244: 461; 1.231–232: 471; 1.232: 466; 1.237: 461; 1.237 ff.: 484; 1.238: 133; 1.240: 133; 1.244: 461; 1.255–256: 419 (2); 1.266: 328; 1.293: 503; 1.301: 133; 1.302: 142; 1.310: 363; 1.313: 361; 1.322: 402; 1.334: 142; 1.343: 383 (2); 1.387: 507; 1.388: 411; 1.405–408: 96; 1.418: 423; 1.420: 352; 1.438: 366; 1.439: 220; 1.459: 507; 1.470: 479; 1.478: 366; 1.512: 134; 1.525: 338, 503; 1.545–550: 485; 1.554: 503; 1.555: 134; 1.559: 485; 1.562: 486; 1.567: 502; 1.581–582: 481; 1.594: 497; 1.598: 509; 1.606: 442; 1.612: 267; 1.631–632: 411, 412, 513 (2); 1.632: 412; 1.687: 512; 1.699: 126; 1.702: 335; 1.710: 384; 1.724: 527; 1.725–726: 203; 1.729–738: 450; 1.735: 288; 1.735–736: 190; 1.736: 133; 1.739: 507; 1.762: 485; 1.769: 170; 2.6: 142; 2.14: 328; 2.24: 128; 2.28: 343, 344; 2.91: 380; 2.107: 410, 411; 2.108: 405; 2.117: 111, 436; 2.118: 448; 2.125–143: 502; 2.151: 266; 2.183: 483; 2.211: 383; 2.213: 495; 2.217–222: 374; 2.221–222: 374; 2.231: 417; 2.235–250: 370; 2.236: 371; 2.239: 350; 2.239–240: 374, 375; 2.239–241: 367; 2.239–241: 373; 2.241: 373, 378; 2.272: 361; 2.295: 191; 2.256: 140; 2.271: 439; 2.272: 363; 2.281: 506; 2.295: 133; 2.298: 324; 2.315–316: 320; 2.325: 158; 2.331: 133; 2.339–340: 376; 2.350: 134; 2.357: 133, 404; 2.381: 142; 2.410: 175; 2.418: 175, 520; 2.420: 415; 2.427: 507; 2.428: 507; 2.443: 242; 2.446: 131; 2.447–448: 235; 2.450: 131; 2.458: 206; 2.459: 205; 2.493–510: 260; 2.493–497: 329; 2.494: 325; 2.495–496: 299; 2.496: 349; 2.500: 187; 2.509: 507; 2.509–510: 347; 2.522: 266; 2.533–534: 372; 2.548: 507; 2.567: 361; 2.569: 220; 2.574: 142; 2.601–602: 428; 2.607: 430; 2.634: 172; 2.643–644: 312; 2.655: 381 (2); 2.669: 370; 2.670: 436, 437, 438 (2); 2.671: 213; 2.682: 487; 2.690: 380; 2.691: 494; 2.705: 188; 2.723: 410; 2.734: 308; 3.19: 142; 3.35–36: 504; 3.36: 505; 3.38: 437; 3.39–40: 186, 189; 3.40: 187; 3.48: 507; 3.53: 335; 3.56: 135; 3.62: 355; 3.65: 438; 3.74: 311, 324; 3.88: 352; 3.95: 362; 3.101: 175; 3.111: 142; 3.120: 203; 3.121–127: 148; 3.124: 222, 223 (2); 3.141–142: 304, 306; 3.158: 503; 3.163: 318; 3.169–172: 225; 3.170: 224, 226; 3.176: 375; 3.178: 391; 3.179: 357; 3.203: 157; 3.207: 437; 3.213: 181; 3.231–232: 221; 3.244: 429; 3.258: 343; 3.268: 357; 3.293: 441 (2); 3.295: 377; 3.298: 349; 3.303: 142; 3.315–350: 110; 3.322: 128,

401, 448; 3.329–338: 6 n. 18; 3.340: 144; 3.347: 390; 3.347–348: 333, 337, 338; 3.348: 466; 3.353: 269, 507; 3.389: 299; 3.394: 200; 3.405: 333, 334; 3.411–412: 342; 3.421: 362; 3.435: 213; 3.455: 507, 508; 3.457: 424, 503; 3.465: 431; 3.472: 289; 3.481: 361; 3.484: 363; 3.494: 361, 363, 507; 3.523: 362; 3.534: 408; 3.539–550: 334; 3.548: 104, 333, 339 (2); 3.583: 203; 3.584: 238; 3.586: 388; 3.600: 289; 3.613: 360; 3.637: 429; 3.645: 175; 3.647–648: 294; 3.689: 219; 3.699: 142; 3.674: 352; 3.675–676: 522; 3.703: 437; 3.712: 450; 3.740: 179; 3.750: 507; 3.753: 511; 3.765: 362, 526; 3.784: 154; 3.790: 386; 3.794: 487; 3.804: 361; 3.805: 205; 3.809: 478; 3.391: 142

Fasti 1.26: 355; 1.27 ff.: 99; 1.28: 452; 1.43–44: 99; 1.59: 335; 1.65–67: 467; 1.71: 234; 1.82: 200; 1.87: 333; 1.101: 349; 1.115: 349; 1.128: 272, 273, 458; 1.133: 349; 1.137: 199; 1.141: 276; 1.159: 203 (2); 1.185: 448; 1.205: 157; 1.255: 436; 1.268: 328; 1.297–298: 235; 1.301: 157; 1.338: 272; 1.354: 527; 1.384: 128; 1.393: 466; 1.395: 175; 1.405: 519; 1.460: 171; 1.468: 479 (2); 1.495–496: 497; 1.544: 284; 1.572: 331; 1.601: 188; 1.619 ff.: 175; 1.625: 382; 1.639: 294; 1.711: 299; 1.720: 456; 2.2: 355; 2.45: 361 (2); 2.64: 30 n. 20, 132, 133; 2.74: 421; 2.93: 508; 2.106: 304; 2.107: 226 (2), 323; 2.177: 466; 2.224: 358; 2.262: 349; 2.269: 95, 103, 104; 2.276: 128; 2.305 ff.: 374; 2.340: 279; 2.435: 276; 2.450: 277; 2.463: 166, 167; 2.319: 224, 226; 2.339: 485; 2.485: 495 (2); 2.513–514: 349; 2.553: 103; 2.565: 161; 2.571: 175; 2.575: 355; 2.584: 349; 2.623–625: 477; 2.686: 264; 2.730: 133; 2.760: 509; 2.777: 495; 2.782: 411; 2.794: 360; 2.841: 127, 511; 2.850: 434; 3.23: 389; 3.59: 341; 3.69: 495; 3.73 ff.: 99; 3.75: 101; 3.135–150: 99; 3.135–136: 98; 3.145: 101, 355; 3.151–152: 99; 3.167: 97; 3.173: 288; 3.192: 202; 3.229–231: 3.234: 336; 3.245–248: 96; 3.248: 272; 3.255: 276, 277; 3.269: 299; 3.295: 218; 3.301: 176, 474; 3.335: 169; 3.346: 350, 478; 3.352: 474; 3.353: 350, 478; 3.363: 380, 357; 3.366: 167; 3.361: 290; 3.370: 157; 3.404: 208; 3.415–416: 478; 3.461: 503; 3.462: 507; 3.473: 503; 3.483: 469; 3.487: 503; 3.512: 501; 3.518: 421; 3.544: 479; 3.546–547: 185; 3.548: 188; 3.549: 187; 3.549–550: 186, 189; 3.560: 179; 3.561: 179, 180; 3.613: 511; 3.620: 445; 3.634: 343; 3.641: 383; 3.689: 317; 3.695: 376; 3.699: 383; 3.713–790: 188, 463; 3.714: 338, 339; 3.721: 491; 3.738: 376; 3.761: 501; 3.769–772: 469 (2); 3.772: 312, 466; 3.789: 466, 501; 3.789–790: 338; 3.820: 327; 3.829: 441; 3.849: 329, 376; 3.856: 332; 4.7.11–20: 390; 4.13: 188; 4.64: 335; 4.81: 295; 4.103: 483; 4.122; 4.126: 420 (2); 4.134: 323; 4.151: 176; 4.153: 317, 318, 352; 4.193–194: 104; 4.204: 424; 4.222: 104; 4.240: 361; 4.240–241: 363; 4.241: 361; 4.343: 188; 4.365: 477; 4.371: 458; 4.391: 188; 4.406: 527; 4.409: 272; 4.425: 166; 4.439: 316 (2), 320; 4.442: 316 (2); 4.449: 145; 4.454: 165; 4.499: 407; 4.500: 403 (2); 4.515: 495; 4.543: 408; 4.551: 378, 482; 4.581–584: 294; 4.584: 443; 4.601: 365; 4.602: 521; 4.605: 445; 4.625: 458; 4.661: 299; 4.662: 284; 4.673: 355; 4.715: 481; 4.853: 179; 4.865: 452; 4.897: 320; 4.934: 471; 4.939–940: 417; 5.27–28: 225; 5.58: 448; 5.79: 299; 5.102: 188; 5.104: 325; 5.109: 104; 5.118: 200; 5.144: 175; 5.147 ff.: 429; 5.157: 220; 5.178: 491, 492; 5.217: 170; 5.220: 528; 5.299–300: 198; 5.315: 134; 5.340: 526; 5.341: 525; 5.343: 518; 5.345: 519; 5.371: 485; 5.421: 168; 5.425–426: 185; 5.435: 169; 5.449: 349; 5.463: 161; 5.465:

157, 390; 5.474: 188; 5.479–480: 179; 5.480: 185; 5.525: 134; 5.532: 157; 5.539: 493; 5.595: 335; 5.614: 525; 5.626: 386; 5.645: 166; 5.663–692: 463; 5.664: 498; 5.675: 172 (2); 5.683: 227; 5.684: 281; 5.686: 411; 5.692: 349; 5.704: 439; 6.39–40: 277; 6.55: 386; 6.108: 451; 6.132: 441; 6.191: 294; 6.205: 294; 6.209: 281; 6.228: 286; 6.249: 436; 6.303: 168; 6.304: 168; 6.320: 376; 6.321: 299; 6.371: 450; 6.396: 376; 6.408: 500; 6.419–420: 416; 6.425–426: 346, 349; 6.426: 377; 6.458: 481; 6.477: 188; 6.483: 299; 6.509: 135; 6.566: 458; 6.584: 482; 6.662: 328; 6.766: 269; 6.798: 104; 6.336: 116; 6.709: 127; 6.755: 482; 6.775: 453; 6.799: 95, 103, 104 6.799–811: 94; 6.811: 342

Hal. 17: 442; 23: 382; 34: 119; 111: 220

Her. 1.8: 355; 1.9: 516; 1.12: 289, 523; 1.24: 186; 1.41: 489; 1.83: 126; 1.109: 191; 1.114: 439; 2.25: 411; 2.39–41: 511; 2.42: 469; 2.69: 487; 2.72: 253; 2.103: 142; 2.105: 134; 2.112: 362; 2.123: 420; 2.145–148: 186–187; 2.146: 188; 2.147–148: 189; 2.148: 187; 3.26: 352; 3.30: 197, 384; 3.44: 527; 3.53: 511; 3.109: 205; 3.115: 381; 3.133: 382; 3.135–136: 468; 3.145: 418; 4.59: 503; 4.70: 369; 4.71–72: 314; 4.86: 192; 4.91: 220; 4.153–154: 365; 4.156: 486; 4.160: 421; 4.165: 484; 4.168 ff.: 468; 4.169: 468; 5.1: 381; 5.2: 120, 121; 5.3: 188; 5.13: 515; 5.28: 188, 448; 5.43: 424; 5.49: 361; 5.51: 522; 5.57–60: 198; 5.59: 160; 5.123: 361; 5.139: 200; 5.151–152: 374, 376; 5.156: 154; 6.17: 520; 6.28: 252; 6.115: 299; 6.124: 342; 6.141: 126; 6.163: 441; 7.1: 252; 7.1–2: 254; 7.4: 238, 435; 7.10: 411; 7.19: 358; 7.27–30: 517; 7.29: 495; 7.34: 133; 7.35: 227 (2); 7.37–39: 394; 7.51: 365; 7.67: 503, 509; 7.108: 336; 7.123: 213; 7.157–163: 351; 7.165–166: 154; 7.182: 362; 7.194: 188; 7.195: 187; 7.195–196: 186, 189; 8.15: 133; 8.25–26: 521; 8.86: 24; 9.38: 401; 9.39: 263; 9.39–40: 272; 9.63: 299; 9.73–82: 374; 9.79: 361; 9.94: 527; 9.115: 431; 9.146: 360; 9.154: 209; 10.5: 133; 10.33: 153; 10.38: 458; 10.49: 294; 10.73: 127; 10.76: 503; 10.85: 485; 10.99–100: 507; 10.111: 411; 10.111–112: 295; 10.117: 512; 10.131–132: 394; 10.260: 223; 10.147: 171; 11.43: 361; 11.61: 335; 11.110: 361; 11.123: 143; 11.127: 455; 12.3: 250; 12.4: 527; 12.27: 406; 12.33: 192; 12.60: 516; 12.71: 134; 12.84: 238; 12.94: 213; 12.135: 167; 12.155 ff.: 502; 12.171 ff.; 12.181: 431; 13.41: 220; 13.78: 206; 13.90: 411; 13.105: 275; 13.106: 499; 13.117: 495; 13.157–160: 511; 14.16: 434; 14.57: 220; 14.106: 481; 14.109: 439; 14.123: 133; 14.125–126: 207; 14.129–130: 189; 15.24: 466; 15.25: 519; 15.35–36: 312; 15.71: 381; 15.72: 238; 15.76: 307, 309; 15.79: 486; 15.81–82: 250; 15.95: 111; 15.96: 133; 15.106: 286; 15.107–108: 511; 15.124: 233; 15.132: 200; 15.154–155: 416; 15.162: 498; 15.163–164: 133; 15.166: 360; 15.176: 101; 15.214: 365; 16.11: 443; 16.16: 487; 16.58: 294; 16.60: 157; 16.87: 487; 16.102: 296; 16.167: 508; 16.198: 133; 16.231–232: 461; 16.241: 361; 16.243: 361; 16.247–248: 500; 16.281: 424; 16.287: 361; 16.317: 516; 16.320: 233; 16.321: 512; 16.344: 277; 16.352: 279; 17.53–56: 201; 17.75(73): 371; 17.81: 361; 17.141: 203; 17.147: 235; 17.150–151: 227; 17.151: 227; 17.226: 212; 17.194: 250; 18.27: 389; 18.50: 495; 18.58: 454; 18.61: 311; 18.66: 157; 18.71–74: 311; 18.75: 359; 18.109: 242; 18.196: 289, 523; 18.200: 187; 18.203: 424; 19.5: 133; 19.6: 156; 19.48: 453, 454; 19.55–56: 287; 19.56: 296; 19.58: 495; 19.67: 352; 19.98: 184; 19.105: 363; 19.193: 264; 19.193 ff.: 282; 19.193–202; 19.194: 274; 19.195:

282; 19.195–196: 264, 282; 19.196: 263; 19.199: 297; 19.200: 300; 20.59: 133, 306; 20.74: 242; 20.77: 371; 20.79: 372; 20.108: 269; 20.115: 424; 20.117: 424; 20.122: 314 (2); 20.125: 487; 20.175: 187; 20.178: 450; 20.183: 354; 20.190: 134; 20.197: 227; 21.7: 273; 21.12: 487; 21.29: 157; 21.48: 421, 422; 21.61: 143, 191; 21.67–68: 445; 21.77: 450; 21.88: 421; 21.91–92: 226; 21.109: 188; 21.116: 479; 21.119: 154; 21.164: 323; 21.210: 266; 21.217–218: 316; 21.217–220: 314; 21.234: 385

Ib. 13: 382; 31: 10; 62: 423; 159: 372; 229–331: 393, 404; 229–232: 394; 245: 379; 294: 396; 317: 375; 327: 375; 329: 501; 337: 375; 345: 375; 379: 375; 431: 521; 435: 220; 445: 450; 495: 503; 589: 453; 613: 199; 626: 355; 644: 527

Medic. 1: 349; 20: 200; 46: 448; 52: 325; 73: 312

Met. 1.1–2: 161; 1.8: 280; 1.18: 161; 1.51: 458; 1.64: 406; 1.82: 458; 1.110: 203 (2); 1.114: 341; 1.137–138: 204; 1.147: 255; 1.165: 521; 1.170: 281; 1.172: 452; 1.179: 236; 1.181: 435; 1.182: 154; 1.188: 511; 1.192: 519; 1.200: 169; 1.201: 362; 1.216: 406; 1.286: 428; 1.304: 485; 1.378: 493; 1.380: 410; 1.385: 381; 1.387: 280; 1.409: 161; 1.411: 354; 1.417–418: 290; 1.443: 213; 1.446: 188; 1.450–451: 303; 1.452–565: 298; 1.454: 387; 1.484: 314; 1.485: 509; 1.486: 344; 1.486–487: 344; 1.491: 314; 1.495: 135; 1.517–518: 339; 1.523: 499 (2); 1.564: 304, 305; 1.577–581: 174; 1.595–596: 281; 1.610: 161; 1.610–611: 325; 1.637: 332; 1.638: 279; 1.656: 522; 1.656–657: 522; 1.682–683: 355; 1.686: 495; 1.690: 188, 498; 1.716: 378 (2); 1.737: 448; 1.747: 188; 1.753: 494; 1.757–758: 379; 1.762: 389, 508, 509; 1.763: 511; 1.768–769: 511; 1.769: 294; 1.772: 156; 2.2: 220; 2.3: 325; 2.6: 286; 2.8: 309; 2.19: 341; 2.24: 292; 2.32: 294; 2.48: 478; 2.49: 236; 2.101: 383 (2), 512; 2.104: 479; 2.106: 340; 2.112: 294; 2.113: 421; 2.123: 155; 2.125: 522 (2); 2.127: 525; 2.145–146: 364, 365; 2.151: 163; 2.153–154: 478; 2.177: 495 (2); 2.190: 294; 2.198: 526; 2.216: 186; 2.224: 406; 2.234: 478; 2.241: 444; 2.251: 241; 2.279: 423; 2.283: 474; 2.293: 385; 2.305–306: 248; 2.322: 511; 2.323: 493; 2.326: 188, 189; 2.327: 190; 2.327–328: 189; 2.331: 355; 2.336: 174; 2.349: 311; 2.364: 308; 2.376: 443; 2.382: 289 (2); 2.393: 423; 2.395: 354; 2.398: 494; 2.399: 372; 2.404: 371; 2.413: 165; 2.419–420: 453; 2.428: 333; 2.428–429: 281; 2.441: 166; 2.452: 213; 2.459: 418; 2.464: 477; 2.465: 349; 2.470: 295; 2.495: 279; 2.497: 452; 2.513: 443; 2.515: 340; 2.528: 286; 2.544: 139; 2.551: 423; 2.568: 495; 2.570: 157; 2.589: 196; 2.606: 314; 2.616: 271; 2.623: 281; 2.624: 376; 2.631: 348; 2.634: 458; 2.654: 249; 2.658: 377; 2.680–683: 374; 2.680–685: 367; 2.683: 377; 2.722–725: 310; 2.733: 378; 2.737–738: 326; 2.749: 305; 2.752: 295; 2.753: 522 (2); 2.755: 353; 2.763: 389; 2.774: 522 (2); 2.782: 495; 2.784: 432; 2.787: 295; 2.845: 166; 2.850: 458; 2.857: 295; 2.867: 404; 2.872: 396 (2); 3.8: 339; 3.12: 481; 3.14: 129; 3.76: 432; 3.105: 340; 3.107–109: 174; 3.124: 444; 3.145: 487; 3.170: 495; 3.174: 418; 3.184: 421; 3.188: 197; 3.196–197: 161; 3.208: 503; 3.215: 166; 3.220: 246; 3.221: 290; 3.238: 511; 3.261: 434 (2), 435; 3.264: 281; 3.271: 243, 244; 3.276: 448; 3.275: 437; 3.275–278: 436; 3.276: 448; 3.276–277: 438; 3.284–286: 490; 3.316: 344; 3.329: 161; 3.335: 295; 3.336–338: 343 (2), 345; 3.338: 343, 344 (2); 3.339: 188; 3.351: 452; 3.375–376: 382; 3.376: 384; 3.389: 508; 3.420–423: 301; 3.421: 304; 3.423: 314, 458; 3.428–429: 508;

3.442: 362; 3.451: 418; 3.469: 208; 3.470: 171; 3.482–485: 301, 314, 316; 3.494: 517; 3.503: 295; 3.506: 164; 3.511–733: 491; 3.514: 491; 3.516: 437; 3.520: 339; 3.526: 330; 3.529: 458; 3.531: 341; 3.548: 247; 3.552: 213; 3.554–555: 307; 3.556: 225; 3.604: 294; 3.607: 403; 3.609–610: 303; 3.613: 244, 467; 3.633–634: 281; 3.638: 511; 3.658–659: 127; 3.668: 483, 485; 3.697: 281; 3.704: 376; 3.710: 428; 3.731: 169; 4.8: 493; 4.11–17: 176, 501; 4.13: 304; 4.14: 501; 4.15: 502 (2); 4.18: 466; 4.19: 466; 4.17–18: 304; 4.62: 133, 487; 4.102: 404, 405; 4.140–141: 458; 4.153: 318; 4.157: 185; 4.172: 294; 4.192: 133, 134; 4.195: 294, 527; 4.226–228: 294, 378; 4.257: 128; 4.259: 494; 4.261: 165; 4.262: 233; 4.267: 255; 4.307: 458; 4.309: 458; 4.317: 511; 4.320–326: 235; 4.329–330: 317; 4.329–331: 316, 317; 4.329–333: 310; 4.330: 317; 4.332: 314; 4.332–333: 310; 4.342: 322; 4.353–354: 453; 4.373: 238; 4.425: 249; 4.429–430: 491; 4.434: 161, 255; 4.438: 145; 4.443: 161; 4.450–451: 400, 401; 4.504: 431, 458; 4.511: 145; 4.522: 353; 4.599: 378; 4.649: 266; 4.652: 458; 4.679: 352; 4.728: 458; 4.765: 176, 474, 486; 4.782–783: 406; 4.794: 349; 5.10: 154; 5.27: 439; 5.43–44: 199; 5.52–53: 307; 5.92: 382; 5.106: 333; 5.112: 332; 5.146: 269, 343, 345; 5.156: 203; 5.157: 213; 5.174–175: 187; 5.175–176: 365; 5.189: 325; 5.214–215: 365; 5.215: 367 (2); 5.235: 280; 5.255: 342; 5.266: 128; 5.275: 135; 5.294–317: 104; 5.302: 254; 5.315–316: 280; 5.316: 511; 5.329: 340, 387; 5.335: 383; 5.338–339: 470; 5.358: 161; 5.368: 443; 5.373: 155 (2); 5.384: 145; 5.390–391: 420; 5.395: 145; 5.412: 188; 5.413: 291; 5.419: 367; 5.428; 5.454: 458; 5.470: 421; 5.476: 408; 5.487: 291; 5.488: 309; 5.512: 317; 5.534: 247; 5.539: 252; 5.549: 269; 5.554: 252; 5.555: 506; 5.565: 487; 5.569: 145; 5.595–596: 453; 5.619–620: 344; 5.641: 238; 5.663–678: 104; 5.667: 155; 5.693: 332; 6.20: 177; 6.26: 437; 6.30: 425; 6.37: 353; 6.48: 421; 6.122–123: 281; 6.157: 269; 6.160: 379; 6.165: 188; 6.191–192: 349; 6.284: 418; 6.315: 281; 6.325: 163; 6.362: 266; 6.384: 379; 6.412–674: 503; 6.435 ff.: 498; 6.444: 344; 6.479: 509; 6.488: 175; 6.540: 450; 6.592: 469; 6.681: 387; 6.700: 527; 6.705: 323; 6.708: 525; 7.32–33: 152, 394; 7.32–33: 152; 7.37: 262; 7.53: 405; 7.55: 483; 7.59–60: 241; 7.62–65: 402; 7.64–65: 402, 403 (2); 7.80: 353; 7.90: 137; 7.91: 521; 7.96: 294; 7.109–110: 397; 7.150–151: 407; 7.152: 431; 7.177: 203; 7.182–183: 171; 7.190–191: 435; 7.198: 467; 7.215–216: 432; 7.217: 203; 7.221: 378; 7.237: 175 (2); 7.244: 457; 7.244–250: 456; 7.246: 524; 7.246–247: 457;: 7.249: 161; 7.250: 441 (2); 7.255: 477; 7.265: 432; 7.273: 439; 7.276: 479; 7.287: 432; 7.291: 448 (2); 7.316: 432; 7.336: 359; 7.350: 385; 7.394: 317; 7.404: 341; 7.408–415: 400; 7.408–419: 400; 7.414: 401; 7.427–428: 196; 7.438: 382; 7.444: 185; 7.450: 176; 7.510: 171; 7.529: 389; 7.538: 353; 7.548: 432; 7.549: 157; 7.588–589: 198; 7.600: 270 (2); 7.626: 448; 7.634–637: 300; 7.643: 389; 7.654: 441 (2); 7.661–663: 497; 7.662–663: 497; 7.663: 497; 7.678: 391; 7.692: 247, 344; 7.692–693: 242; 7.724–725: 360; 7.729: 126; 7.732: 154; 7.736: 205, 220; 7.796: 205; 7.798: 336 (2); 7.800: 133 (2); 7.803: 133; 7.855: 186, 187; 8.8: 415; 8.9: 437; 8.15: 379; 8.15–16: 325; 8.23: 408; 8.51: 235; 8.66: 382; 8.83: 296; 8.83–84: 296; 8.110: 382 (2); 8.120: 407 (4); 8.120–125a: 394; 8.121: 485; 8.134–135: 411; 8.159: 188; 8.169: 404; 8.208: 481; 8.236: 178; 8.237: 294; 8.243: 452; 8.330: 294; 8.405:

266; 8.445: 441; 8.448: 161, 173; 8.451–457: 250; 8.452: 249; 8.461: 434; 8.476: 162; 8.481: 249; 8.488: 168; 8.488–489: 168; 8.488–490: 365; 8.504: 174; 8.508: 157; 8.524–525: 161; 8.525: 163; 8.526: 353; 8.533: 331; 8.539: 170; 8.564: 221; 8.568: 437; 8.596: 444; 8.598: 467; 8.609–702: 214; 8.625: 188; 8.674: 448, 458 (2); 8.686: 438; 8.702: 221 (2); 8.703: 332; 8.724: 334; 8.732: 485; 8.737: 200; 8.743: 175; 8.786: 247; 8.788: 406; 8.800: 442; 8.808: 322; 8.823–824: 356; 8.857: 468; 8.857–858: 469; 8.875: 332; 9.3: 299; 9.44: 135; 9.91–92: 320; 9.103: 317; 9.143: 418; 9.146: 443; 9.160: 471; 9.164: 155; 9.238: 299; 9.244: 135; 9.269–270: 281; 9.322: 499; 9.333: 387; 9.340: 220; 9.371: 511; 9.382: 242, 243; 9.418–419: 269; 9.425: 203; 9.427–428: 435; 9.433–434: 248; 9.434–435: 438; 9.459: 508; 9.465: 450; 9.472: 389; 9.475: 263 (2); 9.481: 220; 9.493: 444; 9.495: 418; 9.495–496: 263; 9.497: 262, 263, 411; 9.503–504: 185; 9.504: 179, 185; 9.509: 477; 9.522: 188; 9.537: 522; 9.539: 522; 9.546: 244; 9.598–599: 141; 9.563: 187; 9.599: 142; 9.605: 508; 9.613: 404; 9.613–615: 394, 395; 9.615: 393, 404, 405; 9.616–617: 158; 9.641: 340; 9.647–648: 397; 9.648: 405, 485; 9.654: 281; 9.682–683: 353; 9.688: 391; 9.698: 383; 9.702–703: 169; 9.720: 133; 9.724: 243; 9.760: 234; 9.783: 220; 9.793: 188, 189; 10.1: 115, 357; 10.9: 166; 10.12: 162; 10.13: 217; 10.15: 444; 10.16: 162; 10.20: 157; 10.21–22: 400; 10.22: 401; 10.29 ff.: 127; 10.30: 252; 10.34: 178; 10.38: 246; 10.66–67: 401; 10.75: 190; 10.76: 444; 10.106: 220; 10.120: 408; 10.130: 473; 10.163: 247; 10.167: 409; 10.171: 381; 10.196: 441; 10.202: 450; 10.203: 344; 10.206: 220; 10.209: 346 (2), 347, 349; 10.218: 303; 10.237: 452; 10.239: 493; 10.267: 225; 10.270: 188; 10.272: 306; 10.300: 266; 10.301: 378; 10.307: 181; 10.307–310: 181; 10.309: 182; 10.329: 235; 10.336: 500; 10.341: 266; 10.345: 418; 10.359–360: 450; 10.368: 228; 10.368–370: 287; 10.380: 187; 10.396: 438; 10.399: 493; 10.402: 522; 10.402–403: 522 (2); 10.405: 479; 10.422: 387; 10.427: 269, 275; 10.443: 135; 10.462: 318; 10.478: 181, 182; 10.482: 157; 10.501: 307; 10.545: 424; 10.551: 485; 10.558: 206; 10.573: 382; 10.594–596: 314; 10.611: 111; 10.616: 391; 10.626: 158; 10.633–634: 246; 10.635: 205; 10.642: 197, 384; 10.645: 246; 10.673: 128, 467; 10.698: 485; 11.48–49: 173; 11.57: 307; 11.61: 162; 11.87–88: 239; 11.125: 176; 11.132: 501; 11.136–145: 239; 11.165: 305; 11.165–168: 301; 11.166: 226, 321 (2), 323; 11.167: 326; 11.168: 331; 11.174: 387; 11.177: 343, 344; 11.196: 379; 11.206: 503; 11.251–252: 365; 11.262: 367; 11.266: 388; 11.314: 233; 11.318–320: 196; 11.386: 509; 11.408: 247; 11.421–473: 502; 11.452: 247; 11.489: 229; 11.472: 203; 11.475: 328; 11.496: 416; 11.500: 253; 11.553: 416; 11.586: 289; 11.592: 447; 11.592–593: 447; 11.592–645: 289; 11.593: 389; 11.595: 458; 11.613: 220; 11.613–614: 263; 11.618–619: 295; 11.623–624: 289; 11.624: 289; 11.626: 220, 263; 11.638: 220; 11.650: 356; 11.654: 255, 256; 11.660: 161; 11.662: 227, 424; 11.669: 173; 11.670: 253; 11.672–673: 300; 11.706: 187; 11.715: 294; 11.727: 242, 243; 11.729–730: 154; 11.732: 441; 11.758: 444; 11.761: 341; 11.783: 389; 12.54: 458 (2); 12.72: 341; 12.150–157: 270; 12.152: 270; 12.182: 438; 12.189: 341; 12.198: 205; 12.216: 317; 12.222: 521; 12.223: 317; 12.256: 458 (2); 12.357; 12.398: 417; 12.405–406: 410; 12.445: 385; 12.467: 200; 12.475–476: 524; 12.530: 333; 12.553: 200;

12.556–558: 343, 344; 12.577: 332; 12.578: 176, 486, 522; 12.585: 304; 12.586: 234, 409; 12.591: 162; 12.598: 387; 13.43: 450; 13.45–46: 415; 13.126–127: 436; 13.131–132: 246; 13.174: 201; 13.195: 238; 13.231: 436; 13.252: 220; 13.261: 188; 13.289: 327, 328; 13.313: 415; 13.380: 455; 13.424–426: 170; 13.449: 162; 13.465–467: 477; 13.516: 151; 13.517: 439; 13.528: 341; 13.547: 485; 13.601–602: 432; 13.604: 163; 13.607: 174; 13.624: 247; 13.639: 176, 524; 13.650: 387; 13.669: 501; 13.687–689: 164; 13.696: 188; 13.704: 471; 13.719: 442; 13.730–731: 402, 403; 13.732: 403; 13.732–733: 402, 404; 13.732–734: 376, 403; 13.733: 403; 13.739: 522 (2); 13.742: 286; 13.775: 268; 13.789: 311; 13.804: 381; 13.818: 220; 13.824: 214; 13.852–853: 294; 13.900–14.74: 402; 13.941: 432; 14.18: 157; 14.18–19: 384; 14.24: 133; 14.43–44: 431, 432; 14.44: 432; 14.60: 279; 14.60–67: 402; 14.61 ff.: 329; 14.70 ff.: 174; 14.75: 402; 14.91: 503; 14.96: 448; 14.99: 503; 14.100: 343–344; 14.111: 446; 14.111–112: 445; 14.112: 481; 14.116: 257; 14.116–117: 145; 14.117: 162; 14.125: 445; 14.132: 208; 14.138: 357; 14.139: 134; 14.142–143: 438; 14.143: 439; 14.172: 152; 14.198: 255; 14.216: 458; 14.227: 233; 14.254: 199; 14.255: 458; 14.263: 357 (2); 14.265: 251; 14.275–276: 432; 14.276: 432 (2); 14.299: 432; 14.301: 390; 14.318–319: 349; 14.320: 341; 14.321: 288; 14.366–367: 311; 14.375: 294; 14.418–419: 101; 14.441–442: 178; 14.442: 188; 14.443: 189; 14.465: 203, 495; 14.486: 155; 14.486–487: 381; 14.489: 418; 14.504: 458; 14.521: 220; 14.539: 433 (3); 14.555: 286; 14.590–591: 445; 14.606: 458; 14.619–620: 179; 14.623–624: 410; 14.654: 297, 299; 14.655: 437; 14.659: 438; 14.669: 450; 14.693: 384; 14.695: 125; 14.696: 344; 14.711: 396; 14.711–713: 395; 14.712: 151; 14.712–713: 152; 14.715: 353, 441; 14.716: 153; 14.720: 299; 14.721: 151; 14.730: 455; 14.736: 360; 14.747: 256; 14.843–844: 247, 343; 15.25: 503; 15.31–32: 300; 15.41–42: 232; 15.73–74: 435; 15.75–76: 424;: 15.79: 178; 15.86: 485 (2); 15.106: 439; 15.125: 203 (2); 15.133: 125; 15.133–134: 273; 15.134: 273; 15.136–137: 270; 15.174–175: 424; 15.181: 416; 15.186: 284, 285; 15.187: 284; 15.196: 313; 15.199–213: 424; 15.227: 439; 15.234: 448; 15.259–260: 391; 15.320: 129; 15.322: 129; 15.392–393: 180; 15.420–422: 229; 15.482: 388; 15.494–497: 156; 15.500: 379; 15.532: 252; 15.535: 145; 15.500: 378; 15.555–556: 174; 15.557: 436; 15.575: 471; 15.575–580: 270; 15.581: 333; 15.581–582: 334; 15.583–584: 365; 15.584: 247; 15.587: 266; 15.612: 202; 15.622–623: 104; 15.651–653: 300; 15.659: 365; 15.663–664: 388; 15.664: 389; 15.672: 220, 221; 15.713: 419; 15.762–763: 249; 15.780–781: 248; 15.781: 249; 15.790: 310; 15.795: 270; 15.797: 162; 15.808–809: 249; 15.820–821: 238; 15.868: 234; 15.873: 234

Ponto 1.1.15: 121; 1.2.7–8: 238; 1.2.15: 187; 1.2.33–34: 379; 1.2.43: 220; 1.2.43–44: 288; 1.2.45: 263; 1.2.54: 283; 1.2.102: 436; 1.2.109–110: 185; 1.3.14: 171; 1.3.32: 486; 1.3.37: 406; 1.3.38: 405; 1.3.77: 226; 1.4.1–2: 437; 1.4.2: 448; 1.4.44: 493; 1.4.56: 184 (2); 1.5.28: 450; 1.5.61: 117; 1.5.74: 117; 1.7.41: 385; 1.8.31: 479; 1.8.32: 242; 1.8.64: 249; 1.8.71: 361; 1.9.20: 458; 1.9.21–22: 158; 1.9.23: 493; 1.9.25: 188; 1.9.31: 158; 1.9.51–54: 179, 180; 1.9.53: 180; 1.10.5: 451; 2.1.25: 233; 2.1.37: 220; 2.1.53: 335; 2.2.9–16: 426; 2.2.13: 427; 2.2.13–14: 429; 2.2.23: 491; 2.2.31 ff.: 429; 2.2.79–80: 298; 2.2.80: 466;

2.3.56: 228; 2.4.23–24: 134 (2), 144; 2.4.30: 233, 496; 2.5.52: 357; 2.5.53: 435; 2.5.63: 104; 2.6.15 ff.: 468; 2.7.23: 346 (2), 349; 2.8.27: 140; 2.8.51: 244; 2.9.29: 357; 2.9.31: 304; 2.9.67: 154, 426; 2.9.67–72: 155, 426; 2.9.68: 426 (2), 431; 2.10.4: 121; 2.10.49: 188; 3.1.26: 431; 3.1.56: 200; 3.1.72: 525; 3.1.122: 402; 3.1.131: 385; 3.1.156: 279; 3.1.159: 234; 3.2.4: 380; 3.2.18: 435; 3.2.29: 208; 3.2.30: 184; 3.2.31: 165; 3.2.49: 215, 217; 3.2.71: 382; 3.2.95: 495; 3.3: 260; 3.3.53: : 363 (2); 3.3.57: 196; 3.3.67–68: 511; 3.4.22: 200; 3.4.26: 188; 3.4.45: 378; 3.4.113: 269, 345; 3.6.14: 384; 3.6.27: 271; 3.6.45: 439; 3.7.13: 125; 3.7.34: 203; 3.9.35: 505; 3.9.52: 479; 3.9.60: 380; 4.1.6: 361; 4.1.17: 144; 4.2.45: 104; 4.3.29: 361, 494; 4.3.31: 229; 4.3.31–32: 228; 4.3.41–42: 137; 4.4.1–2: 497; 4.4.18: 233; 4.4.31: 456; 4.5: 95; 4.6.11–12: 187; 4.6.22: 234; 4.6.31: 495; 4.6.47: 497; 4.7.13: 450; 4.7.24: 415; 4.7.31: 200; 4.8.56: 505; 4.8.69: 385; 4.8.70: 104; 4.9.15: 234; 4.9.34: 235; 4.9.51: 450; 4.9.86: 202; 4.10.1–2: 447; 4.10.3–4: 153; 4.10.25: 402; 4.10.61: 255; 4.10.76: 527; 4.10.78: 503; 4.11.5: 450; 4.11.9: 335; 4.11.21: 450; 4.11.22: 387; 4.12.28: 104; 4.13.1: 234; 4.13.7–8; 4.13.19: 361; 4.14.9: 407; 4.15.21: 450; 4.16: 10; 4.16.6: 128; 4.16.42: 104

Rem.: 3: 424; 29; 1: 121; 5: 154; 16: 192; 21: 192; 23: 126; 26: 431; 35: 435; 47: 375; 53: 479; 69: 133; 81: 450; 109: 288; 112: 527; 115: 450; 124: 507; 128: 507; 136: 507; 143: 519; 181: 330; 187: 320; 197–198: 378; 205: 133; 213 ff.: 370; 213–214: 366; 241: 133; 245: 155, 385; 259: 133; 260: 471; 264: 238; 286: 411, 412; 292: 349; 296: 507; 311: 133; 313–314: 288; 327: 312; 339: 450; 359: 157; 401: 205; 439: 262, 507; 462: 471; 466: 450; 484: 133; 491: 451; 497: 220; 500: 296; 526: 213; 555 ff.: 260; 557: 289, 523; 561–562: 97; 574: 527; 611: 352; 645: 424; 659: 362; 681: 191; 697: 155; 733: 203; 739–740: 407; 759–766: 6 n. 18; 772: 357; 773: 360; 786: 479; 804: 507; 805–806: 461; 809: 133; 809–810: 461

Tr. 1.1: 93, 95, 117, 237; 1.1.3: 130; 1.1.5: 115; 1.1.5–12: 113; 1.1.7: 121; 1.1.8: 124 (3); 1.1.9: 116; 1.1.11: 124 (2); 1.1.11–12: 116, 117; 1.1.34: 343, 344; 1.1.87: 160; 1.1.97: 234; 1.1.117: 452; 1.1.127–128: 406; 1.2.22: 253; 1.2.37: 359; 1.2.53: 439; 1.2.65–66: 252; 1.2.94: 452; 1.3.45: 238; 1.3.51: 361; 1.3.61–62: 406; 1.3.66: 234, 503; 1.4.17: 385; 1.5.1: 234; 1.5.12: 161; 1.5.13: 134; 1.5.19: 493; 1.5.25–38: 228; 1.5.37: 480; 1.5.51: 126; 1.5.58: 335; 1.5.84: 493; 1.6.21: 444; 1.8.18: 416; 1.8.35: 411, 412; 1.8.36: 144; 1.8.37–44: 394, 395; 1.8.39–40: 405; 1.8.40: 395, 406; 1.8.41–42: 395; 1.8.43–44: 393, 404; 1.9.3: 354, 450; 1.9.25: 410; 1.9.41: 269, 345; 1.10.49–50: 238; 1.11.9: 125; 1.11.12: 228; 2.13: 342; 2.19: 375; 2.53: 443, 511; 2.54: 200; 2.77: 361; 2.104: 100; 2.114: 200; 2.135: 382; 2.142: 233, 355, 497; 2.155–180: 351; 2.209: 203; 2.221: 362; 2.259: 118; 2.274: 423; 2.346: 521; 2.421–466: 11; 2.424: 118; 2.447–464: 5 n. 8; 2.453: 332; 2.461–462: 363; 2.490: 524; 2.557: 450; 3.1.6: 126; 3.1.13: 113; 3.1.19: 104; 3.1.23–24: 343, 344; 3.1.35: 126; 3.1.60: 304; 3.1.144: 126; 3.2.1: 406; 3.2.3: 104, 379; 3.2.13: 380; 3.2.20: 295; 3.2.23: 499; 3.3.3: 406; 3.3.9: 288; 3.3.20: 494; 3.3.43: 167; 3.3.43–44: 204; 3.3.44–48: 164; 3.3.51: 424; 3.3.57: 157, 486; 3.3.59: 450; 3.3.59–62: 161; 3.3.62: 386; 3.3.65: 178; 3.3.65–66: 164; 3.3.69: 179, 180; 3.3.70: 185; 3.3.73: 190; 3.3.73–76: 189; 3.3.77: 125; 3.3.83: 161, 186; 3.3.84: 165; 3.4.1: 234; 3.4.32:

479; 3.4.34: 233, 496; 3.4B.53: 242; 3.5.4: 238; 3.5.15: 508; 3.5.55–56: 479; 3.6.23: 493; 3.7.4: 104; 3.7.13–14: 247; 3.7.18: 481; 3.7.31: 506; 3.7.34: 448; 3.7.35: 439; 3.7.35–36: 438; 3.7.41–42: 228; 3.8.37: 242; 3.9.16: 169; 3.9.30: 128; 3.10: 406; 3.10.22: 325; 3.10.35: 266; 3.10.76: 416; 3.11.3: 393, 404; 3.11.3–4: 394, 395; 3.11.7: 405; 3.11.20: 435; 3.11.32: 424; 3.11.55: 406; 3.12.25–26: 235; 4.1.12: 378; 4.1.28: 104; 4.1.47: 144, 145; 4.2.27: 225; 4.2.69: 380; 4.2.73: 173; 4.3.2: 226; 4.3.10: 131; 4.3.39: 450; 4.4.76: 165; 4.4.85: 380; 4.5.1: 234; 4.5.12: 379; 4.6.13: 203 (2); 4.6.17: 438; 4.6.21: 155; 4.6.43: 288; 4.7.11–18: 395; 4.7.12: 399; 4.7.13: 402, 404; 4.7.14: 398; 4.7.16: 128, 401; 4.7.18: 128; 4.8.2: 436; 4.8.6: 434; 4.8.11–12: 205, 206; 4.8.23: 438; 4.8.24–25: 416; 4.9.16: 104; 4.10: 8 *et* n. 18; 4.10.1: 379; 4.10.5–6: 4 *et* n. 3, 434; 4.10.6: 14, 17, 439; 4.10.9 ff.: 10; 4.10.10: 452; 4.10.19–20: 8; 4.10.22: 231; 4.10.27: 438; 4.10.41: 8; 4.10.52: 247; 4.10.65–66: 486; 4.10.68: 8; 4.10.71–72: 7 n. 23; 4.10.73: 205; 4.10.85–86: 161; 4.10.86: 161; 4.10.93–94: 436; 4.10.108: 200; 4.10.115–118: 158; 4.10.116: 208; 4.30.18: 11; 5.1.19: 450; 5.1.34: 104; 5.1.38: 116; 5.1.57: 379; 5.2.11: 175; 5.2.31: 405; 5.2.31–32: 406; 5.2.65 ff.; 5.2.73–74: 380; 5.3: 464; 5.3.1 ff.: 338; 5.3.5: 247; 5.3.10: 104; 5.3.13: 493; 5.3.15: 470; 5.3.17: 250; 5.3.17–18: 248, 250; 5.3.25–26: 250; 5.3.35–36: 468; 5.3.35–43: 465; 5.3.43: 466; 5.3.47–52: 464, 465; 5.5.3: 375; 5.5.13–14: 233 (2); 5.5.36: 163; 5.5.60: 238; 5.7.4: 496; 5.7.16: 256; 5.7.23: 450; 5.7.32: 104; 5.7.55: 379; 5.8.7–8: 228; 5.8.8: 353; 5.8.15: 228; 5.8.28: 244, 486; 5.8.31–32: 497; 5.8.34–35: 416; 5.9.34: 424; 5.10.34: 242; 5.10.51: 361, 494; 5.11.24: 505; 5.11.30: 424; 5.12.23–24: 203; 5.12.23: 203; 5.12.31: 155, 156; 5.12.68: 186; 5.13.18: 227; 5.13.19: 365; 5.13.34: 380; 5.14.2: 140; 5.14.6: 165; 5.14.11–12: 209; 5.14.12: 162

PACVV.
Periboea frg. 3 (276 Ribb.): 156
Trag. 36: 487; 37: 487; 112: 262, 269; 119: 409; 200: 171

PALLADAS *epigrammaticus*
AP 9.169 ff.: 231; 10.58.1: 209

PAMPHILVS
ap. Athen. 11.494F: 305

PANEG.
6.9.2: 486; 12(2).3.6: 201

PANEG. MESS. *vid.* [TIB.]

PARTH.
Erot. 14 West: 298

PASS. PETR. PAVLI
I 214 p. 126: 434

PAVL.
Dig. 2.13.2: 333
Sent. 1.21.14: 173

PAVL. DIAC.
Carm. 22.29 p. 59: 157

PAVL. FEST.
p. 17 M.: 202; 43: 447; 52: 243, 245, 349, 350; 68: 429; 78: 270; 100 (= 89 L.): 270; 110: 273; 120: 419; 147: 96; 304: 277; 501: 429
p. 159 L.: 219

PAVL. PETRIC.
Mart. 2.575 p. 56: 199

PAVL. SIL.
AP 5.279.4: 287

PAVS.
3.21.6: 224; 8.54.7: 325; 9: 339; 9.10.4: 299; 9.30.1: 326, 337; 10: 339; 10.7.8: 298

PELAGON.
110: 163

PERS.
1.69: 428; 1.109: 210; 2.1: 232; 2.1–2: 233; 2.3: 474; 2.16: 273; 3.103–105: 179; 3.104–105: 185; 5.23: 479; 5.52: 213; 5.65: 437; 5.134: 474; 6.9: 445; 6.65: 425; 6.69: 234

PETR.
Frg. 19: 332
Satyr. 25.2: 353; 25.4: 511; 27.1–2: 304; 27.6: 486; 29.3: 304; 43.8: 209; 45.9: 256; 46.7: 256; 54.5: 473; 55.6 l. 5: 177; 57.5: 376; 57.9: 304; 60.8: 471; 61.2: 469; 63.3–4: 304; 63.7: 441; 70.8: 304, 473; 71.7: 178; 77.7: 174, 215; 82.3: 441; 82.4: 508; 83.9: 231; 89 l. 17: 271; 89 l. 4: 387; 101.10: 451; 109.10: 304; 114: 185; 123.190: 441; 123 l. 220: 247; 124 l. 257: 256; 127.1: 141; 127.9: 233; 128.6: 271; 131: 306; 131.8 l. 2: 298 82; 132.15: 205; 133.3: 154; 133.3 l. 6 ff.: 425, 433; 133.3.7–8: 427; 135.8: 175, 195; 137.10: 291

PHAEDR.
1 pr. 7: 376; 1.2.26: 377; 1.12.12: 332; 1.13.1: 509; 1.21.2: 376; 3 pr. 41: 387; 3.1.1–2: 475; 4.21.24: 509; 4.66: 200
App. 8.11–12: 510

PHILARG.
ad Verg. *Ecl.* 6.3 rec. II: 349

PHILO
Somn. 2.8.54: 216; 2.8.55: 221
Vita 51: 304

PHILODEMVS *epigrammaticus*
AP 5.46: 93; 5.121.1–2: 312; 11.34.2: 308

PHILOSTR.
VA 2.37: 264, 282

PHILOSTR. IVN.
Im. 1.10: 325

PHOEN.
1.22–23 Powell: 209

PHYLARCH.
ap. Zen. 6.13 (*FGH* 81 F 83): 232

PIND.
I. 1.7: 303; 3.36: 420
N. 5: 95; 5.24: 330
O. 1.75: 243; 2.21–22: 228; 2.27: 469; 6.41: 305, 309; 7.32: 305, 309; 13.3–4: 445; 13.90: 397
P. 1.1–2: 325; 2.13–20: 148; 2.16: 305; 4.43–44: 217; 4.64: 420; 5.10–11: 497; 9.5: 305; 9.64: 376; 11.52–53: 240
Paean. 9.1 ff. Snell (= *Frg.* 51 Turyn): 294
Frg. 114 Bowra: 253; 124.8: 484; 130: 255; 162: 399

PLAT.
Ax. 371c: 446
Io. 533e: 338
Lg. 1.637b–642b: 480
Phd. 81a: 368; 113a–c: 251; 113a: 252; 113a–b: 252; 113b–c: 252; 113c: 252
Phdr. 117a: 431; 245a: 338; 251e: 287
Phlb. 65c: 513
R. 399d–e: 326; 617c: 250; 6.507d ff.: 294; 9.588c: 398
Smp. 213e: 480

PLAVT.
Amph. 260: 471; 605: 441; 738–740: 273; 782: 409; 1059: 294; 1086: 359; 1093–1094: 169
As. 521: 498; 623: 234; 767: 121; 858: 408; 905: 480; 918: 243
Aul. 279: 458; 371: 289; 459: 365; 565: 269; 608: 365; 682: 389; 692: 276; 776: 280
Bacch. 369–370: 143; 457: 336 (2); 497: 523; 614: 455; 626[a]: 262; 862: 279; 905: 127
Capt. 516: 455
Cas. 7: 126; 8: 408; 472: 318; 587: 524; 813: 262; 881: 317, 318
Cist. 71: 450; 222: 157; 522: 280
Curc. 85: 163; 178 ff.: 199; 178–180: 230; 211: 240; 260–261: 300; 317: 294; 658: 411
Ep. 135: 133, 334; 464: 425; 530: 288
Frg. 10: 143

Men. 4: 237; 181: 311; 285: 262; 908: 455; 990: 127; 1060: 510
Merc. 4–5: 287; 225–226: 274; 227–228: 264; 228–229: 300; 511–512: 404; 841: 240; 858–863: 370; 912: 473; 973: 151
Mil. 456: 360; 984: 140; 1272: 450
Most. 275: 314
Persa 1–2: 370; 312: 425; 313: 441; 361: 491; 821: 344
Poen. prol. 90: 241; 96: 191; 406: 136; 456: 270; 951: 336; 1095: 191; 1163: 280; 1400: 262 (2)
Ps. 43: 136; 100: 504; 174: 160; 240: 355; 315: 262; 646: 411; 695: 371; 795: 256; 941: 435
Rud. 102: 377; 230: 279; 268: 286; 704: 245; 828: 508
St. 81: 207; 700: 524; 702: 480
Trin. 122: 458; 390: 455; 688: 293; 791: 213; 824: 408; 834: 286; 1155: 411
Truc. 540: 182–183; 583: 523; 701: 280

PLB.
3.39.2: 407

PLIN.
Ep. 1.2.5: 232; 1.18.5: 411; 2.3.7: 152; 2.11.23: 118; 4.17.11: 381; 5.6.36: 218; 5.8.13: 489; 5.15.3: 121; 6.10.4: 190; 6.11.1–3: 236; 6.11.3: 232; 6.15: 20; 9.13.12: 381; 9.22: 20
Pan. 68.2: 355; 95.3: 479

PLIN.
Nat. 2.1: 284; 2.16: 510; 2.107: 417; 2.123: 417; 2.128: 417 (2); 3.117: 417; 4.64: 218; 4.89: 175; 4.115: 241; 5.4: 407; 5.66: 184; 5.110: 239; 6.111: 254; 6.143: 222; 7.36: 161; 7.131: 232; 7.186: 158; 7.187: 162; 7.197: 181; 9.11: 326; 9.35: 291; 9.106: 222 (2); 9.124 ff.: 225; 9.125–141: 226; 9.127: 224; 9.135: 224; 9.135–137: 226; 9.137: 224; 9.170: 208; 10.117: 377; 10.156: 457; 10.211: 294; 11.75: 184; 11.154: 319; 11.157: 319; 11.186: 270; 12.45: 308; 12.51: 182 (2); 12.51 ff.: 182, 199; 12.58: 417; 12.66: 309; 12.66 ff.: 309; 12.70: 223; 12.83: 273; 12.84: 526; 12.116: 226; 12.129: 308; 13.1: 184; 13.7: 130; 13.78: 116, 121; 14: 475; 14.62: 475; 14.88: 174; 14.108: 308; 14.119: 458; 14.139: 481; 16.9: 470; 16.44: 277; 18.1: 204; 18.7: 273 (2); 18.9: 203; 18.211: 99; 18.328: 412; 19.19: 163; 19.107: 306; 20.131: 432; 21.44: 437; 21.45: 224, 226; 21.46: 115; 21.47: 316, 319; 22.3 ff.: 224; 23.34: 475; 23.36: 475; 27.146: 430; 28.1: 508; 30.14: 265; 30.95: 430; 31.4–6: 419; 31.16: 129; 31.19: 314; 31.41: 520; 31.51: 417; 31.89: 273; 33.2: 204; 33.11: 326; 33.57: 221; 33.66: 238; 34.37: 327; 34.176: 312; 35.1: 216 (2); 35.45: 224; 35.58: 188; 35.115: 188; 33.118: 314; 33.119: 314; 33.124: 314; 35.150: 177; 36.1–125: 216; 36.1–8: 216; 36.2: 213; 36.12: 188; 36.29: 323; 36.44–46: 216; 36.47–54: 216; 36.48: 215, 218; 36.54–63: 216; 36.102: 217; 36.109–112: 216; 36.121: 520; 36.135: 217 (2); 36.143: 216; 36.156: 481; 36.158: 217 (2), 218

PLM
3.42.33–35 B.: 315; 3.62: 104

PLVT.
Alc. 2.6: 377
Amat. 17: 375
Ant. 17: 4 n. 3
Aud. poet. 5 p. 23a: 428
Caes. 9: 430 (2)
Cat. Ma. 4.4: 193
Cat. Mi. 6.1: 480
CG 36 p. 299 B.: 466
Cic. 19: 430; 28: 430; 35: 173
Lyc. 13: 221
Mor. 268d–e: 429; 268e: 430; 680: 175; 761d: 375; 761e: 372; 920 ff.: 311
Num. 4.8: 374
Qu. Conv. 620: 480
Qu. Rom. 26 p. 270 D.: 173
Rom. 21.1: 96

[PLUT.]
Cons. Apoll. 103b: 497

De mus. 14 (1135f–1136a): 326

PMG
879: 341

Pompon.–Sex.
Dig. 23.2.5: 318; 24.1.31.8: 96

Porph.
Ep. 2.2.199: 230; 3.9:
Epod. 14.7–8: 123
Od. 1.3.9: 486; 1.36.10: 232; 3.1.41: 216; 3.22.2–3: 277; 3.23.20: 273
Sat. 1.8.29: 168

Posidipp.
AP 5.183: 476; 12.120: 462

Pratin.
Frg. 1.4 Page: 517

Priap.
36.2: 304; 47: 481; 50.5: 243; 80.9: 143

Prisc.
Gramm. 2.36.22: 419; 3.407.2: 419

Prob.
Litt. 4.82.27–28: 404

[Prob.]
Ge. 2.2: 501; 3.2: 372; 3.36: 349

Prop.
lib. I: 1.1.1: 112; 1.1.5: 369; 1.1.5–6: 367; 1.1.6: 369; 1.1.8: 371, 435 (2); 1.1.9: 368; 1.1.9–16: 368; 1.1.10: 152, 368, 485; 1.1.13–14: 368; 1.1.14: 504; 1.1.16: 366; 1.1.21: 382; 1.1.23: 391; 1.1.28: 191; 1.1.30: 362; 1.1.31: 237; 1.1.33: 287; 1.1.33: 156; 1.1.35: 507; 1.1.35–36: 133; 1.1.37: 507; 1.2.1–5: 351; 1.2.2: 226, 324; 1.2.3: 308; 1.2.9: 110; 1.2.17: 375, 494; 1.2.25: 154; 1.2.27–30: 110; 1.3.1–2: 504; 1.3.9: 176; 1.3.13–16: 462; 1.3.16: 154; 1.3.17: 382; 1.3.18: 434, 435; 1.3.27: 522 (2); 1.3.27–30: 522; 1.3.28: 267, 277; 1.3.35–36: 358; 1.3.37: 324; 1.3.38: 499; 1.3.39–40: 287; 1.3.45: 356; 1.3.46: 166; 1.4: 211; 1.4.1–4: 372; 1.4.2: 382; 1.4.3: 342; 1.4.5 ff.: 302; 1.4.11: 116; 1.4.12: 191; 1.4.25–26: 211; 1.5.9: 390; 1.5.13: 361; 1.5.20: 154; 1.5.27: 154; 1.5.31–32: 348; 1.6.7: 523; 1.6.10: 507; 1.6.11: 366; 1.6.12: 361, 363; 1.6.13: 445; 1.6.23: 371; 1.6.27: 191; 1.6.29: 154; 1.6.30: 455; 1.6.32: 239; 1.6.35: 184; 1.7.1: 492; 1.7.5: 359; 1.7.6: 382; 1.7.11: 506; 1.7.13: 177; 1.8.1: 133; 1.8.16: 362; 1.8.28: 366; 1.8.32: 240; 1.8.33: 515; 1.8.33–36: 230; 1.8.39: 364; 1.8.39–40: 230–231; 1.8.42: 327; 1.9.1–3: 514;: 1.9.8: 450; 1.9.17: 487; 1.9.19: 485; 1.9.21;: 1.9.34: 191; 1.10.1–10: 516; 1.10.7: 295; 1.10.8: 310; 1.10.25: 489; 1.11: 419; 1.11.1–4: 415; 1.11.5: 133, 184 (2), 287, 455; 1.11.9: 450; 1.11.11–12: 453; 1.11.12: 453; 1.11.16: 487; 1.11.25–26: 189; 1.11.29: 139; 1.11.30: 361, 363; 1.12.13–14: 515; 1.12.15: 235, 505; 1.12.15–20: 148; 1.13.19: 154; 1.13.22: 217; 1.13.29: 417; 1.13.33: 191; 1.13.35: 496; 1.14.2: 476; 1.14.5–6: 219; 1.14.11: 239 (2); 1.14.12: 222, 223; 1.14.13: 240; 1.14.14: 455 (2); 1.14.15–16: 230; 1.14.15–22: 199; 1.14.17–21: 483; 1.14.19: 183 (2); 1.14.22: 228; 1.14.23–24: 230, 240 (2); 1.14.24: 231; 1.15.7: 183; 1.15.8: 111; 1.15.9–14: 502; 1.15.10: 375, 504, 505; 1.15.13: 517; 1.15.15: 142; 1.15.21: 142; 1.15.25: 503; 1.15.26: 424; 1.15.27: 361 (2); 1.15.31: 133; 1.15.33: 135; 1.15.33 ff.: 510; 1.15.41: 191, 507; 1.16.21: 153; 1.16.24: 183; 1.16.25: 153; 1.16.29: 155; 1.16.30: 152; 1.16.34: 411; 1.16.35: 153; 1.16.37: 280; 1.16.37–38: 427; 1.17: 147, 204; 1.17.9: 411; 1.17.12: 170; 1.17.13: 361, 363; 1.17.13–14: 149 (2); 1.17.16: 152; 1.17.18: 154; 1.17.20: 179 (3); 1.17.22: 170, 185; 1.17.23–24: 167; 1.18.1–4: 504; 1.18.3: 153; 1.18.11: 468 (2); 1.18.13: 153, 495; 1.18.17: 131; 1.18.18: 366, 510; 1.18.21: 198,

361; 1.18.26: 153; 1.18B.39: 223; 1.19: 147, 204; 1.19.1: 154; 1.19.7: 142; 1.19.24: 364; 1.20.1: 507; 1.20.2: 135; 1.20.6: 417; 1.20.15–16; 1.20.16: 505; 1.20.17: 324; 1.20.32: 361; 1.20.47: 453; 1.20.51: 507; 1.22.7–8: 198

lib. II: 2.1.5: 324; 2.1.17: 247, 385; 2.1.19: 154; 2.1.28: 198; 2.1.55: 362; 2.1.58: 450; 2.1.71–78: 159, 351; 2.1.74: 494; 2.1.77: 174, 179; 2.1.78: 189; 2.3.1–2: 471; 2.3.9–15: 212; 2.3.10: 320; 2.3.10 ff.: 314; 2.3.10–12: 317; 2.3.11–12: 313; 2.3.17: 212; 2.3.17–22: 110; 2.3.19: 212; 2.3.21: 212; 2.3.43–44: 183; 2.3.49: 484; 2.3.54: 360; 2.4.1: 126; 2.4.5: 451; 2.4.12–14: 370; 2.6.15: 375; 2.6.21: 505; 2.6.23: 142; 2.6.24: 362; 2.6.28: 360; 2.6.31: 361; 2.7.11: 361; 2.7.17: 125 (2); 2.8: 149, 150; 2.8.1: 151; 2.8.5: 358; 2.8.8: 228; 2.8.11: 490; 2.8.12: 151; 2.8.13: 271; 2.8.15: 372; 2.8.16: 353; 2.8.17: 150; 2.8.18–20: 150; 2.8.19: 161; 2.8.25: 126; 2.8.25–28: 150; 2.8.27: 495; 2.8.29: 142 (2), 151, 154; 2.8.32: 154; 2.9.2: 358; 2.9.4: 362; 2.9.11: 165; 2.9.19–20: 360; 2.9.31: 361; 2.9.32: 362; 2.9.41: 353; 2.9.47: 450; 2.10.12: 104; 2.11.4: 423; 2.12.4: 133; 2.12.20: 154; 2.12.23: 295; 2.13.5–8: 195; 2.13.9: 154; 2.13.9–12: 148; 2.13.10: 362; 2.13.11: 197, 506; 2.13.17: 159, 295; 2.13.17 ff.: 147; 2.13.17–26: 148; 2.13.17–36; 2.13.26: 421; 2.13.27: 164; 2.13.28: 167; 2.13.29: 180; 2.13.29–30: 179; 2.13.31: 186; 2.13.32: 178; 2.13.35–36: 9, 11, 189; 2.13.43: 450; 2.13.44: 249; 2.13.45: 422; 2.13.53: 314, 375; 2.14.15: 450; 2.14.17–18: 253; 2.14.21: 358; 2.14.26: 188; 2.15: 22; 2.15.1: 233; 2.15.13: 191; 2.15.25: 450; 2.15.28: 362; 2.15.35: 153; 2.15.37: 385; 2.15.41: 207; 2.15.48: 280, 493; 2.15.49: 365, 383; 2.16.4: 361; 2.16.18: 225; 2.16.19: 450; 2.16.26: 111; 2.16.39: 132; 2.16.47–56: 513; 2.16.55: 226; 2.17.3–4: 287; 2.17.14: 431; 2.17.20: 362; 2.18.2: 362; 2.18.8: 183; 2.18.9: 330; 2.18.20: 438; 2.18.31: 314; 2.18.37: 424; 2.19.11: 203; 2.20.3: 354; 2.20.11: 347; 2.20.14: 383 (23; 2.20.20: 481; 2.21.1: 361; 2.21.3: 347 (2), 349; 2.21.11: 375; 2.21.12: 324; 2.21.15: 361; 2.21.17: 358; 2.22.20: 111; 2.22B.47: 522 (2); 2.22B.47–48: 287; 2.23.7: 370, 371; 2.23.7–8: 370; 2.23.12: 361, 363; 2.24A.6: 154; 2.24B: 204; 2.24.15: 361, 363; 2.24.16: 376; 2.24.25–29: 370; 2.24.27: 430; 2.24.29: 371; 2.24.33–34: 423; 2.24.34: 233; 2.24.35–36: 185; 2.24.34: 370; 2.24.37–38: 495; 2.24.40: 111; 2.24.41: 191; 2.24.42: 116; 2.24.49: 424; 2.24.50: 170; 2.25.1: 133; 2.25.22: 361, 362; 2.25.31: 324; 2.25.47: 287; 2.25.48: 362; 2.26.8: 380; 2.26.23: 240; 2.26.26: 488; 2.27.11: 192; 2.28A.3: 142; 2.28A.3–4: 417; 2.28.5–8: 513; 2.28.9 ff.: 427; 2.28A.9–14: 425, 434; 2.28A.10: 111, 411; 2.28A.12: 442; 2.28A.13: 111; 2.28B: 237; 2.28B.39: 209; 2.28B.40: 448; 2.28B.42: 206; 2.28B.43: 188; 2.28C: 237; 2.28C.47–48: 421; 2.28C.48: 142, 421, 422; 2.28C.51: 311; 2.28C.59–60: 233; 2.28C.61: 139; 2.29A.1: 264; 2.29A.8: 482; 2.29A.9: 362; 2.29A.15: 226; 2.29A.17: 182; 2.29A.22: 523; 2.29B.24: 154; 2.29B.33: 154; 2.30.1: 361, 494; 2.30.9: 369; 2.30B.16: 328; 2.30B.27–28: 250; 2.30B.29: 132; 2.30B.37 ff.: 338; 2.31.5–6: 321; 2.31.16: 321; 2.32.1: 410; 2.32.27: 361; 2.32.28: 169; 2.32.29: 418; 2.32.48: 300; 2.32.52: 410; 2.32.57: 375; 2.33.3: 450; 2.33.5: 352; 2.33.11: 361; 2.33B.27: 363; 2.33.31: 389; 2.33.39: 476; 2.33.39–40: 472; 2.34: 6 n. 18; 2.34.2: 151; 2.34.9: 133; 2.34.34: 132; 2.34.56: 101; 2.34.71: 235; 2.34.79: 325; 2.34.80: 350; 2.34.91–92: 144, 251

lib. III: 3.1: 93; 3.1.1–4: 127; 3.1.5: 104, 128; 3.1.7: 361; 3.1.8: 113,

117; 3.1.17: 247, 250; 3.2.6: 278; 3.2.7: 337; 3.2.9: 338; 3.2.9 ff.: 195; 3.2.10: 220, 221; 3.2.11: 215 (3), 217 (2), 218 (2); 3.2.11–14: 214 (2); 3.2.13: 218, 219; 3.2.13–14: 337; 3.2.14: 520; 3.2.39–46: 351; 3.3: 260; 3.3.1: 128, 300; 3.3.1–2: 127; 3.3.13: 127, 128 (2), 129; 3.3.14: 325; 3.3.25: 330; 3.3.27: 128; 3.3.32: 129; 3.3.35: 470; 3.3.39: 478; 3.4.9: 385; 3.5.3: 211; 3.5.3–6: 208; 3.5.5: 181, 211, 212, 213 (2), 214; 3.5.13: 208; 3.5.13–18: 208; 3.5.14: 208, 209, 210; 3.5.21: 175; 3.5.23–25: 445; 3.5.24: 436, 439; 3.5.25–46: 445; 3.5.26: 132; 3.6: 9, 12 n. 41, 13; 3.6.2: 13, 21, 468 (2); 3.6.5: 527; 3.6.11: 13; 3.6.24: 13; 3.6.31: 13, 386; 3.6.36: 13; 3.6.39: 505; 3.6.42: 13; 3.7.61: 361; 3.7.62: 286; 3.7.72: 126; 3.8.1: 264; 3.8.10: 362; 3.8.11: 362; 3.8.15: 494; 3.8.27: 522 (2); 3.8.30: 205; 3.9.35: 154; 3.10.10: 487; 3.10.22: 526; 3.11.1: 362; 3.11.1–2: 514; 3.11.13: 375; 3.11.17–20: 374; 3.11.30: 362; 3.11.31: 142; 3.11.49: 362; 3.12.15: 139, 235; 3.12.16: 142; 3.12.19: 242; 3.12.22: 508; 3.12.23: 142; 3.12.35: 203; 3.13: 147; 3.13.5: 181; 3.13.6: 222, 223; 3.13.7: 492; 3.13.15: 183; 3.13.17: 324, 431; 3.13.18: 359; 3.13.20: 157; 3.13.23: 360, 361; 3.13.23–24: 359; 3.13.24: 362; 3.13.39: 380; 3.13.52: 303; 3.14.7: 362; 3.14.33: 385; 3.15.1–2: 287; 3.15.9: 362; 3.15.13: 361, 442; 3.15.14: 382; 3.16.4: 518; 3.16.15: 187; 3.16.23: 179; 3.16.23 ff.: 147; 3.16.24: 343; 3.16.25–30: 188; 3.17: 338, 461, 463 (4); 3.17.1–2: 501; 3.17.3: 461; 3.17.3–4: 461, 470; 3.17.5: 462; 3.17.19: 466; 3.17.23: 451; 3.17.28: 487; 3.17.31: 305, 306, 307; 3.17.32: 321, 323; 3.18.1–4: 415; 3.18.2: 419; 3.18.11–12: 195; 3.18.17: 524; 3.18.23: 401; 3.18.24: 487; 3.18.28: 239, 240; 3.19.15: 206; 3.19.27: 257; 3.19.28: 495; 3.20.1: 482; 3.20.3: 152; 3.20.15: 514; 3.20.21: 324; 3.20.30: 343; 3.21.3: 133, 191; 3.21.28: 506; 3.22.1–4: 415; 3.22.15: 494; 3.22.24: 520; 3.22.26: 518; 3.22.28: 487; 3.22.42: 142; 3.23.18: 482; 3.23.23: 473; 3.23.23–24: 523, 524; 3.24.1: 362; 3.24.7: 183; 3.24.7–8: 310; 3.24.13: 451; 3.25.13: 442; 3.25.14: 448

lib. IV: 4.1.7: 345; 4.1.24: 270; 4.1.57: 324; 4.1.58: 499 (2); 4.1.61: 118; 4.1.62: 338, 470; 4.1.70: 126; 4.1.73: 238; 4.1.74: 435; 4.1.104: 270; 4.1.109: 324; 4.1.127–128: 170; 4.1.129: 203, 214; 4.2.23: 324; 4.2.38: 172; 4.2.51–52: 380; 4.2.57: 171; 4.3.13: 318; 4.3.29 ff.; 4.3.30: 183; 4.3.49: 142; 4.3.64: 178; 4.4.23: 272; 4.4.24: 273; 4.4.39–40: 402; 4.4.52: 111; 4.4.63–66: 264; 4.5: 363; 4.5.21: 183, 222; 4.5.23; 4.5.40: 358; 4.5.56: 226, 324; 4.5.67: 448; 4.6.4: 197; 4.6.5: 198; 4.6.9: 266, 477; 4.6.27 ff.: 260; 4.6.31: 303; 4.6.32: 325; 4.6.57: 362; 4.6.65: 362; 4.6.73: 476; 4.6.75–76: 337; 4.6.75 ff.: 338; 4.6.81: 183; 4.6.85: 471 (2); 4.7: 12 n. 41, 259; 4.7.1–2: 161; 4.7.2: 256; 4.7.3: 300, 324; 4.7.4: 164; 4.7.5–6: 287; 4.7.10: 210; 4.7.16: 482; 4.7.21–22: 411, 495; 4.7.23–24: 167, 204; 4.7.28: 173; 4.7.29–30: 164; 4.7.31: 507; 4.7.32: 179, 180; 4.7.34: 173; 4.7.35: 13, 21; 4.7.43: 190; 4.7.52: 401; 4.7.59–62: 446; 4.7.60–62: 446; 4.7.83: 188; 4.7.83–84: 164, 188; 4.7.85–86: 189; 4.7.91: 210; 4.8: 12 n. 41; 4.8.10: 399; 4.8.23: 335, 442; 4.8.37: 13; 4.8.38: 476; 4.8.45: 480; 4.8.48: 499; 4.8.55: 362; 4.8.56: 487; 4.8.68: 13, 343; 4.8.70: 13; 4.8.74: 346; 4.8.79: 13; 4.9: 430; 4.9.24: 219; 4.9.25–26: 428; 4.9.26: 429; 4.9.38: 379; 4.9.47: 323; 4.9.63: 332; 4.9.69: 428; 4.9.71: 333; 4.11.2: 253; 4.11.5: 253; 4.11.8: 256; 4.11.11–12: 195; 4.11.13: 249, 382; 4.11.15: 254; 4.11.30: 101; 4.11.41: 427;

4.11.64: 205; 4.11.87: 382; 4.11.97: 173

PRVD.
Perist. 2.529–530: 235; 10.239–240: 107; 11.219–220: 221; 12.49: 221
Sym. 1.139: 107; 2.605: 241; 2.908: 205

PVBL.-SYR.
Mimi 17: 177
Sent. 295: 229; 320: 229

QVADR.
Frg. 81 P.: 434

QVINT.
Inst. praef. 6: 511; 1.1.1: 359; 1.5.43: 98; 1.9.2: 174; 1.10.42: 203; 2.3.10: 134; 2.4.31: 157; 2.14.4: 121; 3.8.46: 208; 4.2.94: 271; 5.5.2: 208; 5.13.26: 509; 6.3.60: 495; 7.9.5: 179; 8.3.26: 340; 8.3.42: 125; 8.5.2: 157; 8.5.33: 157; 8.6.19–20: 200; 8.6.24: 176; 9.2.39: 154–155; 9.4.27: 331; 10.1.93: 6 n. 18; 10.1.111: 331; 11.3.45: 137; 11.3.85: 332; 11.13.130: 134; 12.10.48

[QVINT.]
Decl. 3.4: 418; 4.12 p. 79.1 ff. Lehn.: 10 n. 36; 6.19: 153; 9.20 p. 185.28 ff.: 10 n. 36; 11.7: 433; 323.5: 434; 337 p. 329.29: 238; 348 p. 371.17–18 Ritter: 329

RHET. HER.
4.9: 508; 4.16: 516; 4.32.44: 160; 4.43: 176; 4.60: 321, 326

RHIAN.
Frg. 10 P. (= 265 [56] J.): 372

RVFIN.
5.93: 462

RVTIL.-NAM.
1.5.8: 235; 1.247–248: 453; 1.248: 454; 1.249 ff.: 415; 1.588.5: 133

SALL.
Cat. 6.3: 226; 23.6: 517; 25.2: 110; 48.1: 359; 52.21: 280; 58.3: 269; 58.15: 161
Hist.
Iug. 1.5: 269; 61.1: 238; 71.2: 288; 78: 407; 102.9: 229

[SALL.]
Rep. 1.2.5: 160; 2.1.2: 229; 2.13.2: 201

SALV.
Eccl. 4.33: 474

SAMM.
758: 418

SAPPH.
5.1 L.-P.: 243; 16.17–20: 230; 94.18–28: 526; 96.6 ff.: 310; 96.18–29: 526; 104: 94; 112: 315; 114: 93; 137: 93; 140a: 93; 208: 478

SCHOL. ADT
Il. 9.457: 428

SCHOL. HES.
Op. 643: 428

SCHOL. HOR.
Od. 1.21.2: 303

SCHOL. JVV.
9.53: 96

SCHOL. LVC.
Civ. 9.1 ff.: 446

SCHOL. PERS.
2.1: 232 (2)

SCHOL. S.
OC 793: 344

SCIP. MAI.
ap. Gell. 4.18.3 (= Malcovati *ORF*^{3} 3 p. 8): 435

SEDVL.
Carm. pasch. 1.44 *CSEL* 10 p. 18: 199; 1.188 p. 29: 208

SEDVL.-SCOT.
Carm. app. 2.23 p. 239: 199

SEN.
Apoc. 2.1: 283; 4.2: 208; 4.21: 208; 7.2 l. 9–10: 290; 13: 398
Ben. 1.1.8: 135; 1.4.4: 353 (2); 6.21.4: 388; 7.9.5: 324; 7.27.3: 448
Dial. 1.6.3: 271 (2); 1.9: 221; 2.9.4: 479; 2.19.4: 383; 3.5.3: 391; 3.6.3: 384; 3.20.5: 271; 4.2.5: 173; 4.33.6: 170; 5.10.4: 409; 6.6.2: 355; 6.18.2: 420; 6.25.3: 161; 7.2.4: 226; 7.25.3: 423; 7.26.6: 191; 9.8.4: 230; 9.9.6: 121; 9.10.5: 227; 10.7.10: 437; 10.20.3: 185; 11.7.1: 284; 11.7.4: 140; 11.10.4: 228; 12.2.5: 170; 12.10.7: 221; 12.16: 500; 12.16.2: 173
Ep. 2.6: 230; 11.4: 317; 11.9: 235; 24.18: 253; 24.22: 158; 31.5: 354; 49.2: 388; 51.1: 420; 51.1 ff.: 419; 61.1: 388; 66.6: 487; 66.45: 508; 70.11: 422; 70.23: 294; 81.26: 388; 83.22: 485; 87.40: 230; 90.9: 221; 90.20: 324; 90.41 ff.: 194; 90.42: 221; 94.58: 227; 94.60: 227; 94.73: 227; 95.23: 473; 95.49: 125; 98.5: 262; 99.10: 207 (2); 107.8: 497; 108.25: 355; 110.1: 510; 114.9: 216; 115.8: 216; 115.9: 221; 119.12: 230
Nat. 1 *praef.* 3: 344; 1 *praef.* 8: 221; 2.26.1: 161; 2.34.2: 385; 2.38.3: 344; 2.49.3: 384; 3 *praef.* 14: 169; 5.5.2: 291; 6.11: 397
Rem. 16.3: 364
Ag. 13–14: 400; 14: 401; 58: 229; 71–72: 228; 84: 489; 91: 238; 132: 449; 146: 402; 198: 519; 215: 341; 255: 348; 348: 468 (2); 364: 456; 493: 295; 553: 345; 706–707: 344; 752: 444; 759: 249; 779: 299; 812: 452; 818: 283; 842: 494; 887: 431; 1002: 142; 1003: 151, 154
Herc. f. 132: 286; 132–133: 290; 138: 359; 181: 249; 336–337: 342; 396: 252; 475: 323; 554: 254–255; 555: 145; 587: 217; 599: 443; 609: 443; 610: 249; 664–666: 253; 680: 255; 686: 255 (2); 718: 253; 742: 207; 783–821: 400; 785: 401; 796: 401; 833: 443; 1014: 197, 384; 1065–1066: 289; 1248–1249: 437; 1249: 206; 1325: 241
Herc. O. 143: 405; 143–146: 394; 144: 404; 180: 247; 196: 246; 376: 307; 452: 229; 662: 223; 663–664: 226; 724: 435; 750: 448; 793: 183; 865–866: 290; 956–958: 219; 1012: 145; 1180: 455; 1202: 401; 1478: 162; 1520: 283; 1587: 345; 1636: 219; 1705: 253; 1756: 171; 1829: 171; 1917: 446; 1921: 253; 1985: 210
Med. 1–2: 276; 47: 359; 61: 456; 287: 228; 301–308: 149; 329: 233; 351: 403; 351–352: 402, 404; 559–561: 134;598: 443;: 656: 385; 688: 431; 717: 431; 731: 431; 845: 367; 850: 368
Oed. 117: 183; 157: 176; 171: 217; 204: 288; 226: 169; 230: 349; 251: 452; 267: 322; 269: 349 (2); 276: 128; 414: 469; 419: 499; 425: 323; 430: 297; 451: 161; 467: 239; 508: 111, 466; 509: 312; 554: 165; 555: 431; 556 ff.: 456; 558–559: 457; 583: 255; 700–701: 277; 712–713: 128; 740: 207; 780: 439; 787: 439; 790–791: 169; 942: 470; 1006: 492; 1042: 349; 1051: 523
Phaed. 54: 474; 67: 181, 183; 147: 210; 166: 405; 271: 318; 272–273: 381; 296–298: 374; 297–280: 367; 312: 283; 317–324: 374; 332–334: 283; 362: 451; 376: 314, 315; 388: 226; 408: 411; 416: 133; 438: 434; 477: 253; 494–496: 221; 496–497: 221; 743: 311; 754: 304, 305; 772: 111; 781: 111; 904: 443; 978–980: 228, 229; 1082: 271; 1201: 145; 1212: 443; 1227: 252
Phoen. 53: 201; 146: 126; 604: 239; 604–605: 239
Thy. 126: 200; 156–157: 322; 168: 320; 231: 220; 354: 241; 371: 223; 457: 221; 523–524: 509; 646–648: 220; 838–840: 277
Tro. 264: 470; 386: 452; 470: 236; 511: 245; 835: 218; 836: 215; 852: 402

[SEN.]
Epigr. 51.1: 216
Oct. 49–50: 133; 116–117: 295; 270: 424; 274: 227; 354: 454; 552:

455; 564: 471; 820: 454; 930: 302; 939: 372; 980: 405

SEN.
Contr. 1.1.8: 137; 1.2.5: 238, 383; 1.2.14: 169; 2.2.11: 134; 2.5.7: 226; 2.7: 324; 2.7.3: 111; 3 *praef.* 10: 454; 9: 221; 10.4.17: 111
Suas. 1.12: 237, 495; 3.1: 355; 6.17: 158; 6.27: 123

SERV.
Aen. 1.310: 218; 1.446: 218; 1.699: 345; 2.133: 273; 2.134: 171; 2.417: 183; 2.539: 171; 3.64: 173, 285; 3.85: 387; 3.92: 349; 3.300: 343; 3.357: 177; 3.573: 163; 4.518: 171; 5.735: 446 (2); 5.745: 273; 5.760: 243; 6.43: 213; 6.48: 171; 6.79: 197; 6.218: 167, 168; 6.253: 270; 6.417–423: 400; 6.544: 383; 7.14: 328; 7.198: 286; 7.761: 372; 8.64: 196; 8.314: 429; 8.654: 99; 8.656: 386; 10.652: 411; 11.189: 165, 166; 11.210: 170 (2)
Ecl. 6.3: 349; 8.82: 272, 273; 10.6: 289
Ge. 1.43: 99; 1.146: 230; 1.166: 467; 2.4: 345; 2.380: 457; 3.2: 372; 3.82: 162, 312; 4.464: 325

SERV. AUCT.
Aen. 1.155: 345; 4.64: 270
Ge. 3.36: 349

SEXT. EMP.
Pyrrh. Hyp. 130: 217

SIDON.
Carm. 2.473: 246; 9.259–260: 6 n. 18; 14.3: 232; 23.269: 332; 24.66: 219
Ep. 2.8.2: 188; 4.6.3: 232; 4.8.5 vers. 1: 245; 8.16.1: 123; 10: 5 n. 8; 130.7

SYLLOGE INSCRIPTIONVM GRAECARVM (*SIG*[3])
1024.24 D.: 501

SIL.
1.107–108: 246; 1.118: 511; 1.155: 241; 1.157–158: 239; 1.503: 451; 2.524: 208; 2.551: 401; 3.59: 283, 285; 3.179: 474; 3.222–223: 104; 3.223–224: 481; 4.186: 188; 4.324: 226; 4.329: 191; 4.508: 252; 4.719: 239; 5.36: 356; 5.267–269: 208; 5.269: 210; 6.73: 200; 6.146–147: 219; 6.442: 199; 6.457: 332; 6.476: 456; 6.504–505: 154; 6.561–562: 354; 7.101: 523; 7.169: 521; 7.201: 502; 7.425: 485; 7.439: 329; 7.441: 478; 7.748: 486; 8.116: 443; 8.166: 288; 8.183: 452; 9.62: 386; 9.95: 185; 9.159–160: 235; 9.266: 188; 10.47: 386; 10.142: 431; 10.274: 451; 10.344: 356; 10.436 ff.: 511; 10.484: 239; 10.519: 157; 11.48: 208; 11.177 ff.: 379; 11.214–215: 523; 11.288: 326; 11.348: 388; 11.418: 451; 11.567: 160; 12.121: 188; 12.132: 447; 12.220: 378; 12.250: 295; 12.261: 357; 12.613: 356; 13.347: 329; 13.357: 120; 13.395: 168; 13.399: 359; 13.402: 288; 13.404–406: 457; 13.405–406: 457; 13.412: 349; 13.501: 386; 13.560: 256; 13.573: 253, 254; 13.594: 400; 14.197: 188; 14.253: 286; 14.472: 378; 14.476: 410; 14.658: 226; 15.23: 307; 15.23–24: 307; 15.53: 233; 15.88: 272; 15.101: 360; 15.116: 226; 15.144: 345; 15.161: 244; 15.258: 201; 15.284: 356; 15.455: 435; 15.491: 188; 15.701: 188; 16.99–100: 417; 16.217: 160; 16.342: 489; 16.363: 321; 16.560: 241; 16.569: 226; 16.603: 436; 17.18: 329; 17.27: 424; 17.339: 435; 17.341: 495; 17.361: 471

SISEN.
Hist. 101: 212

SOL.
1.47: 213; 5.24: 322; 12.52: 505; 24.7–8: 209

SOPH.
Ai. 523: 134
Ant. 965: 337
El. 126 ff.: 363; 412: 277; 824–825: 294
Frg. 575: 228; 607: 466; 871: 228; 871.6: 311; 874: 466
OC 793: 344; 1568–1578: 400

OT 380 ff.: 226
Phil. 394: 239
Tr. 1098–1099: 400

Stat.
Ach. 1.19: 378; 1.184: 486; 1.161–162: 314, 315; 1.241: 143; 1.252: 472; 1.255: 247; 1.262: 321, 323; 1.287: 234; 1.487: 387; 1.524: 435; 1.539–540: 219; 1.557: 400; 1.570: 489; 1.575: 328; 1.582: 187; 1.595: 203; 1.620: 356; 1.735: 188; 1.742–744: 403; 1.774: 471; 1.911: 197; 2.5: 323; 2.23: 166; 2.157: 328
Silv. 1 *praef.*: 116, 378; 1.1.18–20: 281; 1.2.2: 304, 330; 1.2.38: 370; 1.2.118: 245; 1.2.125: 225; 1.2.127: 240, 241; 1.2.142: 478; 1.2.148: 217; 1.2.148–149: 216; 1.2.148–150: 215; 1.2.149–150: 218; 1.2.152: 215; 1.2.232: 188; 1.2.244: 315; 1.2.244–245: 315; 1.2.252: 5 n. 8; 1.2.255: 30; 1.2.256: 505; 1.3.35: 220; 1.3.37: 518; 1.3.108: 241; 1.4: 237; 1.4.1–2: 233; 1.4.78: 406; 1.5.2: 337; 1.5.3: 338; 1.5.4: 376; 1.5.26–27: 520; 1.5.34: 215, 218; 1.5.37: 216; 1.5.40: 217; 1.5.51: 285; 1.6.31–34: 520; 1.6.85: 285; 2.1.17: 505; 2.1.41: 314, 315; 2.1.45: 383; 2.1.54: 422; 2.1.132: 357; 2.1.143: 487; 2.1.147: 422; 2.1.157–162: 179, 180; 2.1.194–207: 445; 2.1.227: 468; 2.2.10: 324; 2.2.20: 518; 2.2.29: 473; 2.2.45: 290; 2.2.85 ff.: 216; 2.2.87: 217; 2.2.93: 218; 3 2.4.11: 326; 2.4.33: 162; 2.4.34: 180; 2.5.27: 281; 2.5.36: 217; 2.6.54–55: 503; 2.6.81: 444; 2.6.86–93: 174, 179, 180; 2.6.88: 180; 2.6.90–91: 173; 2.6.98–102: 445; 2.6.96: 162; 2.7.5: 505; 2.7.12: 506; 2.7.76: 506; 2.7.131: 266; 3.1.1: 203; 3.1.5–6a: 215; 3.1.17: 370; 3.1.18: 452; 3.1.28: 468; 3.1.39: 468; 3.1.41: 176, 473; 3.1.52–54: 283, 417; 3.1.62: 281; 3.1.67: 104; 3.1.71: 233; 3.1.87: 324; 3.1.93–96a: 220; 3.1.94: 219 (2); 3.1.97b–110a: 215; 3.1.99–100a: 216; 3.1.108: 345; 3.1.112: 245; 3.1.174: 204; 3.1.186: 253; 3.2.14: 443; 3.2.17–18: 419; 3.2.61–64: 149; 3.2.85–86: 402; 3.2.86: 404; 3.2.92: 447; 3.2.112: 210; 3.2.129–130: 396; 3.2.139–140: 226; 3.2.140: 225; 3.3.13: 477; 3.3.16: 444; 3.3.21: 249; 3.3.22: 210; 3.3.22–26: 445; 3.3.23: 446; 3.3.24: 145; 3.3.27: 401; 3.3.33–34: 179; 3.3.57–58: 374 (2); 3.3.58: 374; 3.3.61–62: 240; 3.3.62: 466; 3.3.101: 518; 3.3.140: 104; 3.3.155: 281; 3.3.183–184: 281; 3.3.187: 444; 3.3.193: 444; 3.3.206: 444; 3.3.211: 307; 3.3.211–213: 180; 3.3.212: 179; 3.4: 304; 3.4.5: 245; 3.4.7: 473; 3.4.8: 304; 3.4.26 ff.: 301; 3.4.39–40: 303; 3.4.44: 473; 3.4.55: 225; 3.4.56: 314, 315; 3.4.57–58: 281; 3.4.60–63: 473; 3.4.61: 281; 3.4.78: 305; 3.4.99: 473; 3.4.101: 204; 3.5.2: 202, 522 (2); 3.5.4: 358; 3.5.13: 185; 3.5.23–24: 205; 3.5.36 ff.: 216; 3.5.37–38: 205; 3.5.55: 135; 3.5.90: 215; 3.5.96: 419; 3.5.99: 473; 3.5.106–107: 205; 3.5.110: 242; 3.9.92: 223; 4.1.1: 452; 4.1.17: 281; 4.1.38: 204; 4.1.46: 281; 4.2.12: 475; 4.2.14–15: 281; 4.2.15: 334; 4.2.26: 281; 4.2.26–29: 126; 4.2.27: 215; 4.2.38: 217; 4.2.38–39: 215; 4.3.25–26: 419; 4.3.76–77: 379; 4.4: 95; 4.3.146: 233; 4.4.10–11: 135; 4.4.60: 204; 4.4.71: 505; 4.4.76: 225; 4.4.80: 397; 4.4.102: 135; 4.5.17 ff.: 195; 4.5.50: 116; 4.6.18: 222, 223, 232; 4.6.20: 213; 4.6.56–57: 176; 4.6.80–81: 486; 4.6.98: 299; 4.7.25–26: 118; 4.7.31: 236; 4.8.8–9: 473; 4.8.40: 232; 4.9.7: 115; 4.9.8: 123; 5.1.25–26: 337; 5.1.60–63: 239; 5.1.61: 183; 5.1.136: 165; 5.1.164–165: 281; 5.1.205: 208; 5.1.210–216: 180; 5.1.225: 225; 5.1.231: 161; 5.1.237–238: 178; 5.1.253–257: 445; 5.2.32: 174; 5.2.125: 281; 5.2.461: 405; 5.3.6: 338; 5.3.24: 210; 5.3.169–171: 419; 5.3.225: 499; 5.3.277–287: 445; 5.4.4: 296; 5.4.16: 356, 468;

5.5.2: 129; 5.5.3 ff.: 425; 5.5.31 ff.: 329; 5.5.38 ff.: 379; 5.5.57: 489; 5.5.66: 154; 5.5.79: 472
Theb. 1.96: 217; 1.114: 221; 1.161–162: 315; 1.338: 283; 1.376: 492; 1.398–399: 345–346; 1.503: 249; 1.650: 196; 1.263: 183; 1.569: 128; 1.628: 387; 1.698: 305; 1.701: 313; 1.705–708: 339; 1.712: 487; 2.31: 401; 2.48: 145, 443; 2.53: 401; 2.59: 289; 2.61: 399; 2.155: 238; 2.231: 314, 315; 2.244: 354; 2.479: 200; 2.527: 285; 2.667: 162; 3.141: 203; 3.250: 286; 3.415–416: 356; 3.532: 400; 3.646: 386; 4.55: 252; 4.182–183: 342; 4.378: 339; 4.383: 502; 4.414: 210; 4.486–487: 400; 4.521–523: 253; 4.536: 206; 4.600–601: 250; 4.765–766: 30; 5.110: 203; 5.166: 384; 5.274: 249; 5.367: 495; 5.465: 203; 5.670: 101; 5.683 ff.: 433; 6.211: 471; 6.212: 174; 6.375 ff.: 372; 6.376: 249, 253; 6.589: 451; 6.612: 306; 6.688: 283; 7.35: 323; 7.38–39: 321; 7.96: 129; 7.299: 352; 7.464: 158; 7.566: 223; 7.750: 281, 387; 7.782: 144; 7.782–783: 254; 7.783: 401; 8.30: 252; 8.38–39: 443; 8.90: 436; 8.175–176: 129; 8.253: 318; 8.333–334: 269; 8.765–766: 469; 9.27: 400; 9.139: 425; 9.317: 342; 9.336: 322; 9.434–437: 379; 9.548: 468; 9.573: 273; 9.604 ff.: 276; 9.690: 226; 9.758: 304; 9.851: 253; 10.148–149: 356; 10.313: 471; 10.326: 171; 10.615: 235; 10.628–630: 104; 10.694: 127; 10.771: 237; 10.829: 505; 10.926: 203; 11.75: 249; 11.103: 197; 11.108: 505; 11.344–345: 154; 11.400: 323; 11.650: 441; 12.99: 499; 12.138: 309; 12.220: 187; 12.297: 283; 12.312: 323; 12.434: 257; 12.537: 324; 12.559: 210; 16.620: 224; 12.623: 470

STR.
4.5: 239; 5.2.3: 415, 417; 5.2.9: 415, 417; 5.4.5–6: 419; 8.5.7: 217 (2); 12.8.14; 13.1.23: 238, 239; 13.4.5: 238 (2), 240; 16.4.19: 181

STRATO *epigrammaticus*
AP 6.212: 230; 12.175: 473; 12.205: 441; 12.208: 95

SVET.
Aug. 1: 270; 71: 480; 91.1: 266; 94.1: 10 n. 36; 100.2: 170, 171; 100.3: 10 n. 36; 101: 171, 172
Cal. 5: 208; 22: 327; 27.2: 457
Claud. 11.4: 127
Frg. 176 p. 275 Re.: 273; 176 p. 286 Re.: 457
Iul. 208
Nero 34: 428
Tib. 6.1: 386; 74: 327
Vita Tibulli: 26, 27, 30
Vesp. 19: 96; 19.1: 96

SVIDA (*vel* SVDA)
s.v. λευκὴ ἡμέρα: 232; *s.v.* Sappho: 331

SYMM.
1.91(85): 144; 1.96: 232

SYNON. CIC.
p. 430 B.: 156

TAC.
Ann. 1.24: 499; 1.34: 438–439; 1.55: 439; 2.61: 222; 2.15: 435; 3.2: 173; 4.60: 487; 6.28: 180; 11.10: 340; 12.13: 184; 12.48: 330; 13.10: 100; 13.45: 313; 14.1: 435; 14.59: 353; 15.23: 208; 16.6: 162; 16.29: 487
Dial. 23: 228
Germ. 33: 247
Hist. 1.5: 386; 1.19: 359; 1.20.1: 163; 1.41–42: 18–19; 1.45: 185; 1.49: 284; 2.55: 299; 2.76: 134; 4.23: 489; 4.46: 196

TER.
Ad. 90: 151; 728: 411; 751: 317, 360; 859: 207; 867: 390; 898: 238; 903: 140; 938: 317
And. 177: 332; 289: 127; 719: 371; 868: 383; 956: 236; 260: 359
Eun. 91: 133; 219: 287; 348: 167; 649: 516; 709: 280; 733: 462; 1020: 491
Heaut. 209–210: 508
Hec. 196: 411; 612: 389; 777: 227; 787: 523

Phorm. 152: 473; 165: 243; 437: 389; 601: 279; 735: 294 (2); 909: 332; 1005: 262

TERT.
Anima 48.1: 264
Idol. 14: 96; 14.6: 96, 102
Pud. 13: 345

THGN.
725–726: 209; 1063 ff.: 199; 1129: 484; 1168: 411

THEOCR.
Idyll. 2.38 ff.: 287; 2.79: 310; 2.85–90: 450; 3.15: 369, 380; 3.15–16: 393, 404; 3.39: 152; 4.42: 143; 4.43: 497; 7.55: 449; 7.65: 476; 7.117: 316; 7.148: 128; 8.23: 115; 8.53: 230; 8.53 ff: 199; 10.10: 287; 11.17–79: 504; 15.114: 184, 308; 16: 230; 18.35–36: 110; 19.15: 476; 21.34: 115; 22.167: 411; 29.35: 411; 30.5 ff.: 287

[THEOCR.]
Idyll. 23: 147; 23.10: 393; 23.19–20: 393, 404; 23.19–26a: 143–144; 23.20: 152; 23.38: 174, 179; 23.44–45: 167; 23.46–48: 189

THPHR.
HP 4.6.5: 224
Lap. 47: 238
Plant. 9.4.2–9: 309

TIB.
1.1: 148, 229; 1.1.1–2: 211; 1.1.2: 202; 1.1.5–6: 230; 1.1.6: 30; 1.1.7–8: 440; 1.1.8: 442; 1.1.19: 375; 1.1.27: 416, 417; 1.1.29–30: 197; 1.1.30: 527; 1.1.33: 103; 1.1.34: 443 (2); 1.1.41: 154; 1.1.42: 101; 1.1.43: 515; 1.1.43–48: 515; 1.1.45–46: 515; 1.1.46: 382; 1.1.48: 241; 1.1.51–52: 199; 1.1.51: 363; 1.1.55: 372; 1.1.57: 154; 1.1.59: 29 n. 16, 159, 422; 1.1.59–69: 147, 204; 1.1.63: 152; 1.1.63–64: 395 (2); 1.1.67: 383; 1.1.69: 205, 247; 1.1.75–76: 266 (2); 1.1.76: 266; 1.1.77: 155, 240; 1.1.77–78: 230; 1.2: 461 (2); 1.2.1: 153, 470, 472, 525; 1.2.1–4: 460, 524; 1.2.2: 295, 296; 1.2.3: 176 (2); 1.2.9: 384, 498; 1.2.11: 156, 166; 1.2.11–12: 156; 1.2.15: 383; 1.2.15–22: 483; 1.2.20: 300; 1.2.31–34: 370; 1.2.31–32: 212; 1.2.33: 371; 1.2.35: 362, 443; 1.2.41: 410; 1.2.42: 410; 1.2.43: 142; 1.2.45: 213; 1.2.56: 505; 1.2.60: 498; 1.2.64: 457; 1.2.65(63): 133, 134, 154; 1.2.67(65): 149, 151(2); 1.2.67–80: 149; 1.2.70: 200; 1.2.72: 153, 154; 1.2.75: 225; 1.2.75–80: 287; 1.2.75–76: 199, 211, 229; 1.2.77–78: 195; 1.2.79–80: 280; 1.2.80: 206, 435; 1.2.81: 281; 1.2.81–82: 434; 1.2.81–84: 425; 1.2.81–88: 277; 1.2.85: 154, 278, 383; 1.2.87: 154; 1.2.90: 498; 1.2.92: 169, 306; 1.2.95–96: 405; 1.3: 414; 1.3.2: 455; 1.3.3: 414, 415; 1.3.4: 253, 414; 1.3.5–6: 170, 173; 1.3.5–8: 147; 1.3.5–9: 159, 166; 1.3.7: 179, 180, 183, 308; 1.3.7–8: 180; 1.3.8: 163; 1.3.14–15: 156; 1.3.18: 527; 1.3.31: 414; 1.3.33: 453; 1.3.34: 162; 1.3.37: 286; 1.3.46: 241; 1.3.48 ff.: 147; 1.3.50: 213; 1.3.51: 345, 443, 503; 1.3.51–52: 280, 425 (2), 427 (2); 1.3.52: 434, 435; 1.3.53: 156, 385; 1.3.54: 163, 188; 1.3.54–56: 186; 1.3.57–66: 446 (2); 1.3.58: 30 n. 19, 446; 1.3.59–62: 446; 1.3.62: 204; 1.3.66: 308, 466; 1.3.71: 399, 400; 1.3.71–72: 399; 1.3.79: 280, 341; 1.3.80: 210; 1.3.83: 138, 139; 1.3.88: 296; 1.3.91: 165 (2); 1.3.93–94: 479; 1.4.1: 465, 469; 1.4.3: 111; 1.4.6: 417; 1.4.7: 176, 341 (2); 1.4.9: 425; 1.4.12: 453; 1.4.16: 306; 1.4.21: 503; 1.4.21–22: 411; 1.4.21–26: 513; 1.4.22: 412; 1.4.23: 345; 1.4.29: 420; 1.4.37: 176; 1.4.37–38: 304; 1.4.41: 495; 1.4.41–52: 370; 1.4.42: 417; 1.4.43: 495; 1.4.45: 286; 1.4.47: 370; 1.4.48: 278; 1.4.56: 306, 528; 1.4.59: 148; 1.4.61: 104, 506; 1.4.61–62: 506; 1.4.62: 104; 1.4.64: 325; 1.4.65–66: 228; 1.4.71–72: 382, 384; 1.4.73: 332–333; 1.4.74: 142; 1.4.77–78: 156; 1.4.83: 443; 1.5.2: 409; 1.5.5: 484; 1.5.6: 177; 1.5.7–8: 127 (2); 1.5.10: 379; 1.5.13–14: 265, 273; 1.5.15: 171; 1.5.17: 243, 358; 1.5.35: 103, 411; 1.5.35–36: 494; 1.5.37: 133; 1.5.37–38: 461; 1.5.38: 153; 1.5.39: 205; 1.5.40: 382;

1.5.41: 362; 1.5.45: 375; 1.5.47: 98; 1.5.47–58: 363; 1.5.50: 432; 1.5.60: 471; 1.5.61–66: 230; 1.5.64: 169; 1.5.67: 156; 1.5.70: 228; 1.5.72: 294; 1.6.2: 369; 1.6.3: 368; 1.6.11–12: 363; 1.6.14: 133; 1.6.15: 142; 1.6.21–22: 428; 1.6.22: 416, 428; 1.6.29: 154; 1.6.31: 157; 1.6.31–32: 379; 1.6.33: 142; 1.6.35: 522; 1.6.37–38: 30 n. 19, 372 (2), 381; 1.6.38: 155; 1.6.39: 165; 1.6.46: 494; 1.6.48: 162; 1.6.50: 269, 281; 1.6.51: 424, 443; 1.6.54: 495; 1.6.57 ff.: 166; 1.6.67: 139; 1.6.67–68: 138, 495; 1.6.71: 165; 1.6.72: 423; 1.6.73: 154; 1.6.75: 139; 1.6.75–76: 138; 1.6.76: 133, 134; 1.6.89: 507; 1.7.1: 385; 1.7.1–2: 248, 250; 1.7.6: 372; 1.7.8: 325; 1.7.14: 286; 1.7.19: 396; 1.7.21: 417; 1.7.26: 30; 1.7.27–28: 380; 1.7.29: 169 (2); 1.7.29–36: 36 *et* n. 26; 1.7.39: 176; 1.7.41: 176; 1.7.43–44: 500; 1.7.45: 299; 1.7.46: 116, 321, 323; 1.7.49: 467, 510; 1.7.49–50: 467; 1.7.50: 176; 1.7.51: 165, 307; 1.7.52: 306; 1.7.53: 467; 1.7.53–54: 465; 1.7.55: 341; 1.7.55–56: 448, 449; 1.7.59–60: 453; 1.7.63: 453; 1.7.63–64: 233 (2); 1.8.1: 154; 1.8.3: 270; 1.8.3–4: 267, 268; 1.8.4: 487; 1.8.5–6: 372; 1.8.7: 466; 1.8.9: 165, 195; 1.8.15: 495; 1.8.33–34: 199, 229, 230; 1.8.34: 231, 240; 1.8.38: 306; 1.8.42: 436; 1.8.45: 165; 1.8.50: 152; 1.8.51: 443; 1.8.52: 115; 1.8.53: 384; 1.8.56: 343, 344, 352; 1.8.59: 495; 1.8.60: 450; 1.8.62: 521; 1.8.63: 116; 1.8.64: 287; 1.8.68: 296; 1.8.70: 198; 1.8.71: 139; 1.8.73: 153; 1.8.74: 352; 1.9.3: 503; 1.9.1–6: 148, 513; 1.9.3: 361; 1.9.4: 438; 1.9.5: 443; 1.9.5–6: 280, 493; 1.9.6: 111; 1.9.12: 186; 1.9.15: 165; 1.9.17: 383; 1.9.19–20: 369; 1.9.20: 369; 1.9.22: 372; 1.9.24: 481, 482; 1.9.26: 333; 1.9.31–32: 212; 1.9.33: 476; 1.9.34: 176, 334; 1.9.37: 155, 363; 1.9.48: 104, 156; 1.9.53–54: 482; 1.9.54: 141, 482; 1.9.57–58: 352; 1.9.61: 176; 1.9.65: 363; 1.9.70: 225; 1.9.71: 352, 353; 1.9.71–72: 199; 1.9.74: 408; 1.9.75, 156: 155; 1.10: 147; 1.10.1–2: 148, 150; 1.10.2: 149, 151; 1.10.1–6: 152; 1.10.7: 212; 1.10.18: 101, 300; 1.10.19: 242; 1.10.19–20: 241; 1.10.26: 162, 469; 1.10.30: 339; 1.10.34: 438, 450; 1.10.36: 209; 1.10.37: 165; 1.10.38: 145, 448; 1.10.39: 341, 448; 1.10.40: 438; 1.10.41: 448; 1.10.42: 141; 1.10.43: 437; 1.10.44: 448 (2), 449 (2); 1.10.46: 203, 241; 1.10.50: 448; 1.10.52: 141, 448; 1.10.53: 165; 1.10.53–56: 206; 1.10.54: 362; 1.10.56: 494; 1.10.57–58: 369 (2); 1.10.59: 152, 361; 1.10.63–64: 235; 1.10.64: 504; 1.10.65: 169 (2); 1.10.66: 410; 1.10.67: 467; 1.13.18: 372; 2.1.2: 101; 2.1.3: 176, 466, 467; 2.1.3–4: 465; 2.1.5: 234; 2.1.7: 527; 2.1.12: 205, 264, 265; 2.1.13–14: 169; 2.1.14: 169; 2.1.25–26: 267, 268; 2.1.26: 270; 2.1.27: 475, 476; 2.1.28: 476; 2.1.29–30: 234, 473; 2.1.33: 188; 2.1.35: 156, 467 (2); 2.1.43: 442; 2.1.46: 241; 2.1.47–48: 29 n. 17; 2.1.53–54: 330; 2.1.55: 176; 2.1.70: 499; 2.1.76: 151; 2.1.78: 169; 2.1.79: 361; 2.1.81: 467; 2.1.83: 188; 2.1.87: 282; 2.1.89–90: 289, 356; 2.2: 302; 2.2.2: 362; 2.2.3–4: 180, 181, 183; 2.2.7: 307, 308, 526; 2.2.8: 380, 473; 2.2.10: 474; 2.2.10–16: 230; 2.2.11: 141; 2.2.16: 183; 2.2.18: 115; 2.2.19: 438; 2.2.19–20: 205, 438, 448; 2.2.20: 436; 2.2.21: 341; 2.3: 147; 2.3.1: 415; 2.3.2: 151; 2.3.5: 382, 389; 2.3.5–6: 525; 2.3.6: 203, 213; 2.3.11: 303, 375, 375–376; 2.3.11–32: 373 (2); 2.3.11–28: 367; 2.3.12: 303, 376; 2.3.13: 133; 2.3.14: 376; 2.3.20: 376; 2.3.23: 165; 2.3.26: 303; 2.3.31: 133, 376; 2.3.33: 410; 2.3.35–48: 148; 2.3.41–42: 214; 2.3.42: 202; 2.3.43–44: 215; 2.3.44: 213; 2.3.52: 200; 2.3.53: 362; 2.3.58: 224, 225; 2.3.63: 176; 2.3.64: 176; 2.3.65: 111; 2.3.66: 501; 2.3.69: 98; 2.3.72: 205; 2.3.73: 153; 2.3.79: 156, 203, 382, 485; 2.3.80: 30 n. 19, 154, 372; 2.4.1: 382; 2.4.1–4: 372; 2.4.3: 116; 2.4.4–5: 369; 2.4.5: 156; 2.4.7: 153, 389 (2); 2.4.11 ff.: 287; 2.4.13: 127; 2.4.13–14: 111; 2.4.15: 266 (2); 2.4.16: 154; 2.4.19: 382; 2.4.20: 266; 2.4.21–22: 230; 2.4.24: 408; 2.4.25: 382; 2.4.27: 363; 2.4.28: 224, 225, 226; 2.4.30: 222, 223;

2.4.35–38: 109; 2.4.43: 216; 2.4.46: 165; 2.4.50: 163, 241; 2.4.51: 268, 507; 2.4.51–52: 156; 2.4.53: 300; 2.4.60: 213; 2.5.1: 339; 2.5.2: 467; 2.5.5: 297 (2), 299; 2.5.6: 467; 2.5.7: 467; 2.5.7–8: 321; 2.5.8: 303; 2.5.11: 343 (3), 345; 2.5.11–12: 339; 2.5.23–24: 415; 2.5.29–30: 328 (2); 2.5.46: 290; 2.5.54: 352; 2.5.58: 294; 2.5.60: 283, 285; 2.5.63: 298; 2.5.63–64: 468; 2.5.73: 380; 2.5.87: 176 (2), 473; 2.5.93–94: 448, 449; 2.5.94: 449; 2.5.103: 505; 2.5.109–110: 450; 2.5.110: 153; 2.5.113: 333; 2.5.121: 165, 303; 2.5.121–122: 465; 2.6.2: 306; 2.6.7: 385; 2.6.15: 369 (2); 2.6.17–18: 434; 2.6.18: 434; 2.6.19: 158; 2.6.19–20: 29 n. 16; 2.6.28: 152, 499; 2.6.37 ff.: 265; 2.6.37: 265; 2.6.40: 448; 2.6.41: 203, 382; 2.6.42: 154; 2.6.43–54: 363; 2.6.47: 382; 2.6.51: 133

[Tib.]
3.7(*Paneg. Mess.*): 25, 27, 28, 29, 30 n. 20; 3.7.1: 108; 3.7.7: 140; 3.7.13: 300; 3.7.17: 363; 3.7.34: 116; 3.7.57: 176; 3.7.64: 447; 3.7.64–66: 447; 3.7.65–66: 290; 3.7.66: 163, 292; 3.7.68: 281; 3.7.71: 397; 3.7.71–72: 402; 3.7.112a: 208; 3.7.113: 203; 3.7.121: 29 n. 16; 3.7.122–123: 291; 3.7.145: 292; 3.7.158: 292; 3.7.160: 233; 3.7.172: 29 n. 17; 3.7.177: 29 n. 18, 154; 3.7.198–199: 240, 241; 3.7.201: 385; 3.8–18: 25, 27; 3.8–12 (*Cerinthus*): 25, 28, 29; 3.8: 97; 3.8.1: 281; 3.8.9: 165; 3.8.10: 125; 3.8.14: 213; 3.8.15–16: 224; 3.8.15–20: 97; 3.8.15: 97, 112; 3.8.15–16: 225; 3.8.19–20: 222, 223, 253; 3.8.20: 183; 3.8.21–24: 97; 3.8.21: 97, 98, 104; 3.8.22: 325; 3.8.24: 112; 3.9.8: 437; 3.9.10: 162; 3.9.18: 352; 3.10: 237; 3.10.1–2: 467; 3.10.2: 303; 3.10.4: 111; 3.10.12: 354; 3.10.13: 451; 3.10.14: 434; 3.10.16: 365; 3.10.19: 339; 3.10.23: 188; 3.11.3–4: 250; 3.11.5–6: 156; 3.11.6: 132; 3.11.6–7: 133; 3.11.7: 134; 3.11.7–8: 127; 3.11.8: 510; 3.11.9: 244, 281; 3.11.11: 385, 522; 3.11.13–14: 133; 3.11.13–15: 141; 3.12.1: 510; 3.12.2: 506; 3.12.3: 125; 3.12.8: 133; 3.12.11: 352; 3.12.12: 213; 3.12.13: 467; 3.13.1: 290; 3.13.3–4: 156; 3.13.7: 154; 3.13.9–10: 500; 3.13–18 (*Sulpicia*): 22, 25, 29; 3.14.8: 495; 3.16.1: 242; 3.16.6: 521 (2); 3.17.1: 191; 3.17.3: 389; 3.17.5–6: 156; 3.18.1: 133; 3.18.5: 264; 3.19–20(*puella innominata*): 16, 25, 27, 29; 3.19.1: 362, 521; 3.19.5: 352, 353, 450, 510; 3.19.15: 512; 3.19.16: 281, 408; 3.19.17: 494; 3.19.22: 521; 3.20.1–2: 156

Titin. *Com.* 58: 289

Trebativs
apud. Macr. *Sat.* 3.3.2: 219

Triph.
52: 428

Tvb.
Hist. frg. 4 (= *HRR* I² 309 Peter): 423

Tvrpil.
Com. 201: 497

Tyrt. *Frg.* 3a.2 Diehl: 305

Valer.
ad Rufin. 2 (= 30.255 Migne): 398

Val.-Flac.
1.6: 360; 1.144 ff.: 372; 1.175: 405; 1.257: 509; 1.260: 474; 1.277: 325; 1.278: 297; 1.281: 132; 1.300: 471; 1.315: 157; 1.385: 321; 1.386: 298; 1.446: 387; 1.651: 345; 1.659: 357; 1.766: 153; 1.843: 446; 1.851: 446; 2.167: 196; 2.218: 386; 2.295: 283; 2.347: 497; 2.348: 471; 2.600: 169; 3.12: 471; 3.481: 312; 3.558–559: 311; 3.694–695: 480; 3.718: 323; 4.19: 331; 4.213: 341; 4.252: 247; 4.334: 298; 4.338: 285; 4.345: 285; 4.362: 360; 4.388: 295; 4.445: 349; 4.603–604: 490; 4.709: 344; 5.6: 327; 5.192: 471; 5.224: 505; 5.332: 273; 6.129: 307; 6.518: 101; 6.539: 480; 6.665: 322; 5.694: 520; 6.709:

309; 6.745: 356; 7.1 ff.: 287; 7.203: 185; 7.276: 499; 7.607–608: 213; 8.347: 307

VAL.-MAX.
1.1.3: 471; 1.1.12: 203; 1.6.1: 471; 1.6.5: 458; 1.6.12: 344; 1.8.2: 284; 2.2.3: 299; 2.2.7: 495; 2.4.5: 457; 2.5.5: 273; 2.6.14: 312; 2.7.12: 517; 3.6.5: 308; 4.3.2: 262; 4.3.7: 327; 5.1.8: 497; 5.6.3: 471; 6.2.8: 200; 7.25: 354; 8.7.2: 341; 8.11.1: 289; 8.13.1: 285; 8.15 praef.: 517; 8.94: 154; 9.1.2: 360

VALG. RUF.
Frg. 1 Büchner: 448

VARRO
Gramm. 132: 247
Lat. 5.34: 202; 5.69: 277; 5.100: 404; 5.104: 273; 6.11: 345; 6.14: 470; 6.27: 99; 6.29: 423; 6.33: 99; 6.42: 359; 7.81: 199; 7.87: 419; 9.47: 326
Men. 36: 228; 44: 419; 92: 283; 234: 239; 322: 219; 333–340 (*tituli*): 342; 361: 361; 382: 223; 423: 254; 427: 357; 432: 311; 462: 311; 467: 104; 480: 308; 482: 351
Rust. 1.2.19: 501; 1.10.2: 202; 1.32.1: 203; 1.40: 119; 1.65: 475; 2.2.16: 523; 3.16.23: 387

VARRO ATAC.
Frg. 14.1 M. (11.1 Bue.): 284; 14.4: 409

VATIN.
Frg. ap. Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.60: 495

VELL.
1.61.4: 4 n. 3; 2.10.7: 236; 2.27.3: 312; 2.56.2: 326; 2.57.2: 266; 2.115.1: 105; 2.127.1: 417; 2.363: 6 n. 18

VENVL.
Dig. 47.10.39: 173

VERG.
Aen. 1.1ᵃ–1ᵇ: 379; 1.1ᶜ: 505; 1.8: 354, 493; 1.18: 246–247; 1.19: 116; 1.23: 243, 244; 1.25–26: 134; 1.30: 382; 1.53: 376; 1.66: 344; 1.79: 344; 1.94–96: 235; 1.118: 396; 1.126–127: 291; 1.127: 294; 1.189–190: 466; 1.208: 288; 1.239: 390; 1.249: 185; 1.263–264: 485; 1.319: 344; 1.325: 256; 1.347: 409; 1.353: 116, 357; 1.364: 362; 1.374: 283; 1.384: 253; 1.393: 452; 1.398: 331; 1.402: 306; 1.403: 307; 1.403–404: 306; 1.404: 323; 1.412: 356; 1.416–417: 182; 1.440: 453; 1.444: 335; 1.446: 225; 1.482: 238; 1.518: 335; 1.526: 443; 1.544–545: 410; 1.569: 244; 1.575: 450; 1.613: 225; 1.627: 348; 1.639: 327; 1.683–684: 482; 1.686: 175; 1.691: 452; 1.701: 418; 1.705–706: 520; 1.715: 508; 1.721: 135; 1.723: 497; 1.726: 221; 1.729: 471 (2); 1.731: 335; 1.734: 467; 1.739: 471 (2); 2.2: 256; 2.3: 203; 2.10–11: 191; 2.18: 444; 2.48: 383; 2.53: 98; 2.112: 319; 2.114–115: 386; 2.126–127: 381; 2.159: 487; 2.160: 365; 2.183–184: 280; 2.199: 297; 2.221: 431; 2.238: 317; 2.247: 436; 2.249: 498; 2.268: 296; 2.270–271: 300; 2.325–326: 455; 2.344–346: 23; 2.364–365: 102; 2.396: 238; 2.398: 254; 2.507–508: 200; 2.567: 163; 2.583: 511; 2.591–592: 490; 2.606–607: 383; 2.617: 345; 2.623: 490; 2.653: 247; 2.722: 485; 2.724: 528; 2.738: 151; 2.750: 203; 2.772: 161; 2.780: 396; 2.781: 239; 2.785: 154; 2.792: 508; 3.27: 441; 3.34–36: 336; 3.37: 116; 3.42: 169, 424, 443; 3.64: 165; 3.66: 174; 3.67: 471; 3.67–68: 174; 3.81: 297 (3), 298, 299 (2); 3.87: 382; 3.89: 345; 3.104: 281; 3.107: 336; 3.119: 303; 3.120: 457; 3.141: 417; 3.150–151: 300; 3.160: 383; 3.162: 387; 3.170: 383; 3.176–177: 365; 3.191: 396; 3.194: 285; 3.215: 493; 3.251–252: 339, 344; 3.252: 346; 3.264: 490; 3.265: 266; 3.287: 188; 3.302–304: 164; 3.303–304: 168; 3.316: 383 (3); 3.321: 408; 3.337: 247; 3.311: 208; 3.330–331: 151, 154; 3.354: 175, 474; 3.355: 471; 3.366–367: 422; 3.376: 444; 3.379: 335;

3.380: 244; 3.405: 357; 3.420–432: 402; 3.420–421: 402; 3.421–422: 396; 3.436: 522; 3.437: 281; 3.457: 436; 3.474: 350; 3.476: 334; 3.493: 496; 3.493–494: 454; 3.495: 396; 3.510: 444; 3.545: 356; 3.586: 116; 3.592: 365; 3.634: 444; 3.641: 490; 3.658: 406; 3.678: 466; 3.693: 303; 3.712: 269 (2);
4.2: 449; 4.5: 287; 4.6: 292; 4.6–7: 283; 4.9: 263; 4.10: 300; 4.26: 145, 443 (2); 4.33: 116; 4.41: 407 (2); 4.50: 365; 4.58: 502 (2); 4.60: 471 (2); 4.61: 456; 4.64: 269; 4.75: 225; 4.77 ff.: 497; 4.83: 103; 4.91: 242; 4.92: 244; 4.95: 362; 4.118–119: 283; 4.128: 380; 4.134: 225; 4.137: 225; 4.141: 409; 4.141–150: 303; 4.147–148: 306; 4.148: 528; 4.149: 306; 4.159: 485; 4.169: 498 (2); 4.171: 435; 4.172: 382; 4.176: 174; 4.183: 331; 4.207: 501 (2); 4.211: 362; 4.215–217: 307; 4.216: 526; 4.242–243: 443; 4.243: 145, 249; 4.262: 226; 4.262–264: 225; 4.296–392: 502; 4.328: 512; 4.314: 127; 4.338: 383; 4.365–367: 393; 4.367: 394, 404; 4.376: 349; 4.381: 524; 4.386: 161; 4.410: 294; 4.412: 369; 4.355: 440, 441; 4.419–420: 153; 4.421: 335; 4.425: 154; 4.425–426: 155 (2); 4.441: 175; 4.455: 401, 488; 4.467: 300; 4.479: 410; 4.511 ff.: 276; 4.517: 169, 273; 4.522–532: 287 (2); 4.530: 389; 4.542: 503; 4.555: 336; 4.569–570: 364, 365; 4.570: 362; 4.583: 286; 4.589: 236; 4.607: 294; 4.637: 273; 4.644: 145; 4.651: 247; 4.670: 397; 4.673: 401; 4.698: 422; 4.775: 471; 5.5: 116; 5.6: 362; 5.14: 345; 5.46: 202; 5.77–78: 174, 457; 5.91: 471; 5.92: 103; 5.97: 457; 5.98: 401, 471; 5.191–192: 442; 5.236–237: 456; 5.238: 524; 5.246: 297; 5.320: 116; 5.395: 438; 5.449: 371 (2); 5.469–470: 458; 5.539: 297; 5.542: 495; 5.571: 311; 5.580: 98; 5.606: 244; 5.689: 344; 5.721: 282, 283; 5.722: 300; 5.724–725: 140; 5.730: 242; 5.733–734: 249; 5.734: 161; 5.736: 457 (2); 5.745: 273; 5.756: 444; 5.776: 103; 5.798: 248; 5.802: 103; 5.816: 378; 5.832: 238; 5.854: 309; 5.861: 356; 5.863: 345; 6.7–8: 340; 6.10: 406; 6.12: 339, 349, 387; 6.25–26: 341; 6.28: 116; 6.51–52: 519; 6.60: 503; 6.70: 498; 6.74: 383; 6.79: 197; 6.82: 350; 6.95: 383; 6.120: 328; 6.125: 256; 6.127: 380; 6.132: 253, 255; 6.134: 253, 448; 6.147: 252; 6.153: 457 (2); 6.164: 410; 6.195: 213; 6.196: 383; 6.224–225: 179; 6.226–228: 173; 6.227: 171, 174; 6.228: 170; 6.230: 309; 6.231: 167; 6.237: 252; 6.244: 474; 6.249: 457, 471; 6.264: 161; 6.265: 251, 252; 6.268: 198; 6.269: 252; 6.275: 439; 6.279: 431; 6.282: 175; 6.283–284: 263; 6.288: 398 (2); 6.292: 161; 6.294: 161; 6.295: 252; 6.295–296: 252; 6.295–297: 251; 6.296: 396; 6.297: 252; 6.298–304: 209; 6.306: 207; 6.307: 317; 6.315: 116, 249; 6.323: 252, 255, 448; 6.324: 512; 6.336: 103; 6.343–344: 348; 6.346–347: 348; 6.351: 512; 6.357: 294; 6.362: 223; 6.385: 210; 6.392–393: 448; 6.401: 161; 6.410: 285; 6.417: 401; 6.417–419: 210; 6.417–423: 400; 6.417–425: 401; 6.419: 399 (2); 6.429: 233, 423, 498 (2); 6.437: 370; 6.438: 249; 6.438–439: 211, 252; 6.441 ff.: 446; 6.442: 368, 369; 6.448: 362; 6.458–459: 510; 6.464: 153; 6.465: 383; 6.475–476: 502; 6.480: 443; 6.505–506: 167; 6.508: 179; 6.513–514: 499; 6.524: 433; 6.533–534: 445; 6.535–536: 283; 6.540–543: 446; 6.544: 383 (2); 6.562: 256; 6.566: 444; 6.614: 383; 6.638 ff.: 446; 6.646–647: 329; 6.647: 331; 6.648: 341; 6.660 ff.: 446; 6.667: 335; 6.698: 383; 6.714–715: 143; 6.729: 396; 6.745: 498; 6.772: 466; 6.784: 341; 6.805: 483, 485; 6.806: 383; 6.832: 383; 6.840: 429; 6.842: 340; 6.847–853: 148; 6.868: 383; 6.869–870: 247; 7.26: 283; 7.34: 378; 7.37: 104; 7.41: 269; 7.56: 101; 7.59–60: 298;

7.96: 383; 7.130: 348; 7.130–132: 347; 7.133: 471 (2); 7.194: 332; 7.198: 286; 7.202: 383; 7.236: 383; 7.265: 480; 7.302–303: 407; 7.311: 383; 7.341: 432; 7.386: 256; 7.414: 284; 7.416–417: 448; 7.425: 524; 7.428: 244; 7.429: 348; 7.435: 256; 7.438: 383; 7.560: 244; 7.572–573: 244; 7.583–584: 354; 7.622: 422; 7.641: 104; 7.649–650; 7.661: 362; 7.691: 341; 7.704: 116; 7.704–705: 495; 7.717: 362; 7.736: 116; 7.785–786: 397; 7.800: 219; 7.805: 405; 7.814–815: 225; 8.26: 296; 8.30: 295–296; 8.33: 300, 356; 8.39: 383; 8.40–41: 493; 8.49: 385, 386; 8.60: 335; 8.64: 286 (2); 8.74–76: 453; 8.81–82: 198; 8.82: 273; 8.82–85: 456; 8.151: 384; 8.153: 295; 8.245: 145; 8.273: 348; 8.291–293: 370; 8.369: 356; 8.377: 242, 243, 340; 8.408: 362; 8.432: 458; 8.445: 444; 8.508: 438; 8.532: 383; 8.552: 485; 8.581: 472; 8.614: 383; 8.622: 285; 8.627: 343; 8.640: 471; 8.643: 386; 8.650: 441; 8.665: 139; 8.720: 312; 9.11: 239; 9.12: 383; 9.24: 196 (2); 9.44: 511; 9.78: 266; 9.82–83: 281; 9.93: 284; 9.104–105: 255; 9.114: 383; 9.138: 23, 154; 9.174: 444; 9.186–187: 359; 9.226: 225; 9.309: 327; 9.312–313: 411; 9.326: 389; 9.337: 452; 9.352: 336, 337; 9.369: 350; 9.405: 313; 9.425–426: 153 (2); 9.480: 196; 9.492: 103; 9.503: 329; 9.504: 376; 9.506: 441; 9.610: 438; 9.618: 331; 9.625: 244; 9.638: 303; 9.656: 256; 9.745: 244; 9.772: 410; 9.787; 9.802: 244; 9.803: 335; 10.11: 383; 10.90–91: 191; 10.92: 481; 10.95: 435; 10.103: 396; 10.137: 306; 10.141–142: 239; 10.162: 103; 10.163–165: 104; 10.170: 487; 10.201: 101; 10.246; 10.254: 336; 10.273–275: 417; 10.284: 157; 10.372: 383; 10.381: 441; 10.471: 252; 10.527–528: 120; 10.538: 299; 10.585: 335; 10.630–631: 357; 10.632: 256; 10.652: 411; 10.706: 244; 10.745–746: 295; 10.766: 175; 10.772: 284; 10.837: 253; 10.875: 345; 10.878–879: 151; 10.888: 441; 10.900: 491; 11.19: 441; 11.35: 165; 11.63: 116; 11.74: 225; 11.94: 332; 11.97: 252; 11.112: 247; 11.124: 256; 11.165: 206; 11.189: 165; 11.244: 284; 11.252: 244; 11.301: 168; 11.401: 383; 11.406: 435; 11.456: 400; 11.497: 321; 11.505: 362; 11.566: 441; 11.592: 150; 11.593: 356; 11.611: 356; 11.631: 116; 11.701: 247; 11.724: 441; 11.734: 362; 11.773: 503; 11.789: 345; 11.795: 411; 11.816: 116; 11.819: 314 (2); 11.821: 408; 11.831: 161; 11.839: 294; 11.841: 489; 12.56–60: 127; 12.65–70: 313; 12.65–69: 315; 12.67–68: 313; 12.72: 383; 12.99–100: 307; 12.139: 376; 12.147–148: 248; 12.156: 244; 12.164: 101; 12.174: 471; 12.178: 244; 12.197: 512; 12.199: 444; 12.206: 335; 12.220: 295; 12.391: 408; 12.429: 281; 12.487: 359; 12.539–540: 238; 12.565: 383; 12.589–590: 102; 12.639: 410; 12.693: 443; 12.802: 333; 12.806: 256; 12.816: 444, 512; 12.819: 344; 12.838: 458; 12.846–847: 404; 12.873: 171; 12.873–874: 208; 12.875: 383; 12.920: 444; 12.930: 253; 12.930–931: 365; 12.938

Ecl. 1.2: 377 (2), 378; 1.6: 411; 1.43: 452; 1.57: 334, 340; 1.63: 135; 1.65: 406; 1.74: 476; 1.75: 154; 1.79: 516; 2.1–5: 504; 2.6: 362; 2.15 ff.: 312; 2.16: 311; 2.17: 383; 2.20: 176; 2.21: 214; 2.25: 223; 2.29: 408; 2.60: 494; 2.62: 409; 2.63: 404, 485; 3.3: 107; 3.3–4: 21 n. 1; 3.11: 440, 441; 3.17: 154; 3.37: 126; 3.78: 408; 3.79: 137; 3.84: 495; 3.85: 104; 3.94: 424; 3.104: 281; 3.108–109: 198; 4.6: 244; 4.8–10: 365; 4.10: 339; 4.13: 481; 4.25: 183, 308; 4.43: 116; 4.47: 250; 4.57: 303; 4.63: 497; 5.11: 435; 5.29: 485; 5.29 ff.: 485; 5.42: 188; 5.42–44: 189; 5.46: 296; 5.56–57: 311; 5.61: 435; 6: 261; 6.3 ff.: 260; 6.4: 441; 6.5: 126; 6.6: 163; 6.8:

378; 6.13: 104; 6.20: 416; 6.41: 244; 6.46: 375; 6.61: 469; 6.69: 474; 6.74–77: 402; 6.75: 403; 6.82: 378; 6.258–259: 477; 7.22: 417; 7.24: 329; 7.25: 470; 7.29: 387; 7.44: 476; 8.18: 141, 142, 381; 8.20: 422; 8.25: 378; 8.27: 342; 8.30: 290; 8.41: 191; 8.43: 380; 8.43–45: 393; 8.46–50: 142; 8.47: 368; 8.47–48: 367, 369; 8.49: 369; 8.58: 454, 455; 8.63: 103, 104; 8.66: 141; 8.66–67: 142; 9.5: 228; 9.15: 269; 9.30–31: 468; 9.33: 104; 9.39: 335; 9.40: 420; 9.40–41: 420; 9.50: 442; 10: 261; 10.4–5: 468; 10.10: 191; 10.21: 260 (2); 10.21–23: 260, 261, 357; 10.22: 133, 496 (2); 10.35: 450; 10.38–39: 312; 10.69: 157, 471; 10.51: 330; 10.52–54: 504; 10.69: 384, 483; 10.72: 104, 416; 10.77: 476

Ge. 1.5: 284; 1.8: 161, 213; 1.9: 517, 518; 1.12: 505; 1.15: 375; 1.18: 467; 1.27: 128; 1.38: 446; 1.40: 244; 1.43–44: 420; 1.57: 181, 182; 1.58: 149; 1.63: 477; 1.64: 213; 1.67: 236; 1.97: 203; 1.117: 202; 1.121: 345 (2); 1.145: 157; 1.166: 469; 1.189: 171; 1.222: 503; 1.237: 272; 1.243: 253; 1.276: 236; 1.277: 145, 255 (2); 1.293–294: 251 (2); 1.294: 331; 1.299: 203; 1.301: 521; 1.328: 345; 1.338–339: 281; 1.344: 175, 481; 1.349: 297, 299; 1.356: 396; 1.359: 223; 1.385: 309; 1.430: 311; 1.431: 310; 1.450: 285; 1.469: 396; 1.472–473: 397; 1.473: 397; 1.492: 213; 1.501: 383; 1.502: 503; 2.2: 501; 2.4: 501 (3); 2.4–5: 486; 2.4–8: 501; 2.7: 467, 501; 2.29: 383; 2.35: 348, 349; 2.37: 480; 2.42: 154; 2.68: 390; 2.92: 213 (2); 2.115: 182; 2.128: 432 (2); 2.130: 431; 2.137: 240; 2.139: 181 (2), 182; 2.143: 178; 2.146: 456; 2.184: 213; 2.192: 471 (2); 2.203: 213; 2.235: 171; 2.248–250: 213; 2.274: 213; 2.330–331: 420; 2.331: 171; 2.338: 391; 2.353: 416, 417; 2.399: 203, 236; 2.426: 442; 2.433: 383; 2.458–467: 214; 2.458–459: 235; 2.461 ff.: 194, 195; 2.463: 227, 326; 2.465: 226; 2.490–492: 235; 2.493–494: 235; 2.495: 225; 2.502: 390; 2.510: 360; 2.511: 161; 2.513: 203; 2.521–522: 320; 2.523–524: 508; 2.524: 360; 2.529: 501; 3.1–2: 373; 3.6: 313; 3.9: 428; 3.17: 201; 3.25: 225; 3.38: 252; 3.42: 231, 474; 3.63: 171; 3.66: 272; 3.67: 439; 3.71: 444; 3.72: 371; 3.73–74: 366; 3.79: 277; 3.85: 397; 3.153: 435; 3.160: 203; 3.197: 406; 3.216: 362; 3.219: 110; 3.252: 372; 3.259: 368, 369; 3.292: 303; 3.316: 184; 3.349–383: 406; 3.359: 283; 3.414: 349; 3.456: 262; 3.481: 432; 3.510: 486, 501; 3.513: 262; 3.518: 165, 167; 3.526–527: 486; 3.530: 288; 4.16: 335; 4.108: 441; 4.118: 213; 4.127: 202; 4.189: 168; 4.207: 486; 4.233: 285; 4.242: 383; 4.252: 451; 4.255: 208; 4.309–310: 174; 4.315: 103; 4.332: 158; 4.344: 290; 4.352: 291; 4.379: 181, 182; 4.380: 175; 4.382–383: 154; 4.384: 524; 4.388: 286; 4.408: 485 (2); 4.425–426: 417; 4.448: 388; 4.452: 436; 4.464: 325; 4.467: 217; 4.472: 161 (2), 208; 4.475: 207; 4.478: 253; 4.478–479: 252; 4.478–480: 211; 4.479: 444; 4.480: 253; 4.483: 400; 4.489: 444; 4.492: 381, 444; 4.496: 252; 4.523: 306; 4.543: 219; 4.546: 457

[VERG.]

Aetna 4: 127; 55: 284; 92: 505; 319: 416; 339: 354; 386: 171; 463: 187; 584: 134; 636: 236

Catal. 4.12: 134; 5.7: 111; 9.1: 312, 314; 9.2: 104, 342; 9.52: 241; 9.59–60: 337, 338; 11: 13; 11.1–2: 517; 13.15: 208; 13.17: 362; 14.6: 169

Cir.: 18 n. 80; 2: 397; 18: 154; 27: 236; 28: 235; 35: 177; 36: 11; 37: 312; 37–38: 283; 38: 285, 286; 59: 403; 59 ff.: 402; 71: 403; 72: 345; 76: 396; 78: 352; 82: 279; 83: 362, 441; 110: 408; 114: 503;

133: 369; 135–136: 369, 483; 137: 483; 144: 321; 151: 321; 161: 489; 185: 494; 199: 344; 222: 199; 229: 474; 237: 499; 245: 511; 247–248: 390; 250: 356; 259: 154; 262: 126; 269: 105; 273–275: 127; 287: 206; 291: 370; 295: 154; 297: 450; 314: 206; 320: 437; 328: 154; 349–350: 290; 355: 137; 359–360: 505; 390: 286; 397: 444; 409–415: 379; 415: 511; 420: 381; 455: 389, 390; 473: 409; 483: 286; 504: 454 (2); 624: 341
Copa 1: 299; 34: 363; 38: 441
Cul.: 17: 128; 18 n. 80; 12: 127; 12–19: 127; 18: 129; 42–44: 283; 48: 415; 63–64: 221; 87: 181, 182; 101–103: 283; 101–102: 283; 107–108: 283; 111: 492; 145: 249; 160: 294; 202: 282; 203: 290; 212: 140; 215: 210; 220–221: 400; 232: 447; 254: 492; 261 ff.: 446; 272: 252; 283–284: 283; 331: 403; 331–332: 402; 333: 144; 366: 239; 372: 144; 372–373: 211, 254, 445, 448; 374: 252; 382: 411; 406: 316, 320; 411–412: 187
Dir. 14: 522; 21: 420; 23: 430; 36: 126; 53: 407 (2); 67: 518; 99: 233; 101: 135
Lydia 6: 137; 27: 238; 51 ff.: 425; 56: 450; 149: 284
Mor. 1–2: 283; 32 ff.: 302; 91: 441; 106: 325
Maec. 158: 455
Priap. 3.7: 352; 8.1: 266; 16.6: 352; 39: 126; 47.5: 516; 83.2: 311

VERR.
ap. Fest. p. 162 M.: 279

VETVS LAT.
Luc. 12.27: 250
Matth. 6.28: 250

VITA TIB.

VITR.
2.6.2: 419; 2.9.13: 112

VLP.
Dig. 15.1.3: 433; 18.1.7 pr.: 485; 29.2.11.2: 433

XENOPHANES
Frg. 1 D. (= 1 W.): 459; 1.4: 472

XENOPHO
An. 6.1.30: 480
Cyr. 2.5: 183

ZENOBIVS *paroemiographus*
6.13 (*FGH* 81 F 83): 232

INDEX RERVM

acueducts 520 (*Aqua Marcia*)

adjective
- affecting the noun partially 322
- in *-osus* 111
- comparative with *magis* + positive 141
- comparatives and superlatives reinforced with *longe* or *ante alios* 408–409
- compounds of *-fer* or *-ger* 431
- governing a dativ 234, 280, 288, 359, 376–377
- *mille* = *innumeri* 213
- pregnant sense 225–226 (*Sidonius* = "purple", "sumptuous")
- substantivization 436–437

adverbs
- poetic tendency to replace them for adjectives 227
- *et* (= "also") 153
- *frustra/nequiquam* 278–279, 450–451
- *hic* (= *tunc*) 296–297
- *interea* 456
- *longe* reinforcing comparatives and superlatives 408–409
- *non* beginning a line, emphasizing a energetic negation 155
- *post* 177
- *potius* 142
- *praeterea* 227
- *primo . . . mox* 174
- *quondam* 138, 375
- *utinam* 450

amaranth (plant) 319–320
"amoebean" song 94
Amor (Ἔρως), epithets of his cruelty 368–369

Apollo 291–293
- sun-god 290–291, 291–293, 294
- god of soothsaying and prophecy 258, 293, 339, 344–345 (*Iovis interpres*), 347–349 (*veridicus augur*), 384–386 (*oracula Phoebi*)
- god of music and poetry (Apollo Citharoedus) 258, 293
- distinctive attributes 301, 321–324 (*palla*), 325–329 (*lyra*)
- performance of a lyre-player 329
- triad of poetic divinities (Apollo-Bacchus-Muses) 337
- pastoral god (Apollo Nomios) 373–375
- *praeceptor amoris* 258, 260
- epiphany in dreams 260, 296
- epithets *Phoebus* (291, 337), *Cynthius* (349–350), *pater* (345), *vates* (349), *augur* (349), *fatidicus* (349), *Latonius* (313, 379), *Delius* (387, 479)
- eternal youthfulness, radiant beauty 297, *300–302*
- androgynous beauty (*puer delicatus*) 301, 304–305, 307 (perfume) 313
- *intonsi crines* (ἀκερσεκόμης) 303–305
  - *flavum caput* (χρυσοκόμης) 305
  - rosy skin (*candor et pudor*) 310–321 *passim*
- laurel as the Apollinean tree 128, 297, 298, *299*
- swan-drawn chariot of Apollo 478

Arabia 180, 181, 182
Assyria 180, 181, 183
Bacchus see Dionysus
Baiae 419–420
Bona Dea 428, 429–430

book
- gift-book (of poetry) 93, 95, 97, 112
- *libellum* 116
- luxury edition (*cultus libellum*) 93, 112–113; as a work of art 126 (*opus*)
- physical description (*ornamenta*) 113–126; *membrana*, *paenula* (cover) 115; pumice-stone 116; *comae* 119–120; *index*, *litterae*, *titulus* 120–121; *cornua*, *umbilicus*, *frontes* 122–124
- calendar (Roman) 99–100

'Gregorian reform' 100
Kalendae 97, 99
Julian solar calendar 99
Romulean lunar calendar 99
Canis (*Sirius*) 417

cases
ablative of association 528
ablative of extent in time 522
ablative of quality 437
ablative of separation 493
accusative of interjection (reinforced by *o!*) 231
accusative of respect 165, 297, 404, 526
dativ complement of adjective 234 (*mihi felicem*), 280 (*obnoxia facto*), 288 (*menti . . . utilis*), 359 (*diversasque tuis*), 376–377 (*similes chordis*)
dative governed by the compounds of *sum* 496
dativ of agent 453
dativ of interest 504
dativ of presence instead of *coram* + ablative 505
dativus sympatheticus 355, 359
double accusative 277
genitive governed by adjectives and verbs of remembering or forgetting 455
instrumental ablative with *ab* 290
objective genitive 191
partitive genitive 486
partitive genitive with verbs or adjectives of remembering or forgetting 184
possesive dative 365, 390, 401
sub + accusative 416

Cerberus 399–402
Chimaera 397–398
Cimmerians 446–447

conjunctions
atque reinforcing a *utinam* 450
postquam with pluperfect indicative 331
quamvis + adjective 517
quamvis + indicative 495
que in the sense of *-ve* 150
sed conferring a radical shift in meaning 204, 329, 486
disjunctive constructions 106 (*seu . . . seu*), 141 (*sive . . . sive . . . sed potius*), 275 (*sive... sive*)
ut with comparative sense 317

Diana
triple goddess (*triformis*) 276
as Selene (Luna) 276, 313
epithets *Latonia* (313)
Dionysus 337–339, 467
as god of prophetic and poetical inspiration 337–339, 470
as god of the vineyard and wine 175–176, 459–472 *passim*, 486–489
epithets *Bacchus* (337, 339), *Lenaeus* (467, 500–501), *Liber* (467), *Pater* (501–502), *Lyaeus* (175), *Semeleius* (341)
attributes of Bacchus eternal youthful beauty (300–302, 466–467); *intonsi crines* (303–304); *cornua* (466); *vitis* (469); *hedera* (469–470); *tyrsus* (470); *patera* (470)
hymns, invocations to Bacchus 462–464
mystery cults (Eleusinian Mysteries) 469, 477
Bacchantes 491, 492 (Bacchic delirium)
Liberalia 464, 467
proelia Bacchi et Veneris 459, 471, 482–483 (contrasting aretalogies of Amor and Bacchus)
friend towards the inebriateds, wrathful towards the sobers or abstemious 487–490
"Indian triumph" 483
Bacchus = "wine"; see Metonymy in Style

Dis (or Ditis) 145–146, 254, 457; see Orcus
Dreams (prophetic) 258–261, 270
apotropaic invocations to conjure away ill-omened dreams 261, 262–263, 266, 411
gods in dreams (Apollo, Mars Quirinus, Amor Lethaeus) 260, 296
as elegiac motif 259–261
somnia fallunt pavidas mentes 271
types (oracular, allegorical, "good", "bad", "true", "false", etc.) 259, 261–262, 263

sub Aurora, when dreams are most true 258, 264, 282, 296
dream-criticism (Artemidorus Daldianus, Cicero) 259–260, 261–262
visum est, introductory formula of dream visions 299–300, 322
Elysium (*campi Elysii*) 444, 445–446
erotodidaxis see *Sermo amatorius*
Etruscans 239, 269, 415
extispicium 267, 268, 269–270
exta 270
haruspices 269
monere 269
funeral rites 159 ss.
burial honours tears (165), libations of milk and wine (173–174), offerings of perfume or spices and tribute of tears (179–180)
conclamatio 167; *ultima conclamatio* 168
cremation (funeral pyre) 161
domus aeterna (burial urn) 178
enshrouding of the corpse 185
epitaph 186–192
inhumation/cremation 162
in sacris nihil solet esse religatum 165, 171–172
cremating and burying *extra pomerium* 164
last farewell (*ave et vale, sit tibi terra levis*) 167
Manes (Di) 168–169
mourners 166
nigra/alba vestis as *tristia insignia lugentium* 173
ossilegium 167, 170, 176–177 (drying of the bones)
purae manus (purification by water) 169
restinctio cinerum 173
tristia signa ("displays of grief") 163–164
umbra = *anima mortui* 161–162
Hell see Underworld
Hellenistic Greek epigram 93
Homeric-style formulas
caeruleus amnis (Ὠκεανὸς ποταμός) 285
candida ossa (ὀστέα λευκὰ) 162
dicite Pierides (ἔσπετε νῦν, Μοῦσαι) 94, 95, 103
miseri mortales (δειλοὶ βροτοί) 272
pectore decidere (ἐκ θυμοῦ πεσέειν), "forget" 133, 134
polysyndeton *-que* . . . *-que* (τε . . . τε) 103
hymn-prayer, cletic hymn 464
invocation to god 261, 275, 462–464 (*Bacchic hyms*), 465
epiphany (παρουσία) 244, 296, 306 (smell of fragrances), 330 (*veniens*), 465, 489 (*convenit*)
aretalogy (δύναμις θεοῦ) 462, 471, 482–486
'Er-Stil' 483–484 (anaphoric *ille*)
asseverative formula *sic tibi* 465, 468–469
deictic particles 477 (*hic*)
yusive formulas 244 (*adsis*), 244–245 (*faveas*), 442–443 (*parce*), 467–468 (*ades*)
repudiation formula (πρόρρησις) 476–477 (*ite procul*)
apotropaic formula (ἀποπομπή) 492

Influences, reminiscences, echoes, models, agreements
Callimachus 260, 302
Catull 135 (emphatic *totus*), 350, 351, 353, 364, 390, 404, 496 (*candida fata*), 502, 504
CLE 158, 171, 178, 189, 190, 261, 422, 454, 479–480
Cynico-Stoic diatribe (moral-philosophical topoi) 193–194; see Topoi
Gallus 260–261, 491, 496
Homerus see Homeric-style formulas
Horatius 97 (*venere Kalendae*), 274 (*saliente mica*)
Lucretius 397
Manilius 513
Martial 94–96 (*peculiar treatment of the Muses*); 97; 135, 414
neoterici 93, 108, 113–114, 117 (*labor limae*), 121–122 (*tenuis*), 125–126, 340, 353, 516 (ἀγρυπνία)
Ovid 101 (*hinc*); 128 (symmetrical pentameters); 186; 189; 200; 203 (*renovare*); 205 (*inque*); 244; 246 (*si fata negant*); 263; 279 (*pertimuisse*); 297 (temporal *hic*); 301 (portrayal of Apollo); 315–317 (similes); 333; 334 (*salve*); 339–340 (*proles Semelae Bacchus*); 343; 349; 367; 377; 389; 390 (*crediderim*); 403; 412; 421; 434

(*facta nefanda*); 436; 437; 438 (*curva senecta*); 439; 440; 485; 486 (*molle cor*); 491; 493 (*laedere deum*); 496; 499 (*ei mihi*); *500*; 507; 508 (*bracchia collo/*); 513
Propertius 150, 151, 159, 368, 390, 445
Seneca 367
Statius 135, 301
[Theocritus] 23 (Ἐραστής) 143–144
Tibullus 150, 159, 166, 229–230, 265, 267, 283, 297, 343, 367, 389, 414, 425, 434, 526
[Tibullus] 97
Virgil 260, 283, 295–296 (*sera quies*), 297, 297–298 (*tempora lauro/*), 315, 357, 359, 364, 367, 377, 380–381, 390, 410, 420 (*purpureum ver*), 476, 496, *500*

interjection
a! 361, 390, 494
ei! 499
o! 231–232

iuncturae
adversi dei 435
ars + adjective 327
auctor + genitive 120
auratae trabes 220
caelestia numina 354
cara coniunx 242–243
causa mortis 187
erepta coniuge 154, 191
ferre dolorem/ 153
felix dies 236
fortia corda 157
impia mens 360
innixa colummnis/ 217
iurare per + accusative 511–512
me duce 481
niveo lacte 176, 457
/non ego 154
pocula Baccho 474
quid ergo? 513–514
senecta + adjective 439
tenuis umbra 161
timidis votis 244
tu modo + imperative or subjunctive 365–366

Kalendae see Calendar
libations 173–174 (burial rituals), 456–458 (sacrificial rituals)

Lucina (Juno) 96, 244, 258, 261, 274, *275–277*
Neaera as sobriquet 107
marble (*marmor, lapis*) 199, 215–218, 221
Carystius (cipollino) 218
Taenarius (three types 'nero', 'fior di persico' and 'rosso antico') 217–218
Synnadicus, Phrygius ('pavonazzetto') 216–217
Matronalia 93, 96–97, 102, 136
mola salsa 272–273

Metre
adjective closing the pentameter *purpureus/* (314)
adverb closing the pentameter *tamen/* (107, 517)
bucolic clause 476
elision
atque without elision (before a consonant) 380
enclyt *-que* avoiding elision 162
final *-ae* diphthong before *et* 494
final *-ī* before an initial *-ī* 505
final syllable of the present infinitive before *et* 153–154
long final vowel before a short initial vowel 347
hiatus *a* | *ego* (389–390)
iambic shortening (*correptio iambica*) 366
line-beginnings *a(h)/* (361), */a pereat* (363), */ergo* (159), */nam* (396), */non ego* (154, 429, 521), */o mihi* (234), */ite procul* (266), */tandem* (290), */tu modo* (365–366), */dixit et* (388–389), */nulla fides inerit* (513)
line-endings *tamen/* (107, 517), *ferre dolorem/* (153), *non haec patientia nostro/* (155), *capillos/* (165), *manus/* (169), *cura puellae/* (191), *limine tecti/* (199), *gaudia vitae/* (205), *tempora vitae/* (208), *innixa columnis/* (217), *imitantia (lucos)/* (220), *Saturnia (votis)/* (244), *ab ortu/* (294), *redimitus tempora (lauro)/* (297), *tempora lauro/* (297–298), *deducta marito* (318), *Pieridesque favent/* (339), *velavit amictu/* (356–357), *labores/* (371), *aequora ponti/* (396), *senex/* (449), *tempora mensae/* (497), *periuria (linguae)/*

(503–504), *bracchia collo/* (508), *requiescere noctes/* (516), *convivia mensae/* (521), *adde merum/* (525), *tempora nardo/* (526)
metri causa (metrical conveniences) 98, 116, 134, 141, 156, 177 (*post haec* for cretic *postea*), 186, 196, 206 (*senecta/senectus*), 224 (*concha* for *margarita*), 227 (*praeterea*), 242 (*posse frui*), 286–287 (*caerulus/-leus*), 290, 317 (*puellae* for *virgines*), 421 (*Persephone* for *Proserpina*), 430 (*taetra venena* for *atra venena*), 488 (*vina*), 493 (*laesi/*⏑⏑⏑ *ira dei*), 498 (*dies*)
participle closing the pentameter *sequens/* (343)
rythm
hexametrical 97
holoespondaic 97
internal rhyme (*Sperrung*) *nostris//... avis/* 100–101; *formosae//... avarae/* 110
scansion 161 (*fuero*), 182 (*Panchaia*), 183 (*Eoi, Arabes*), 225–226 (*Sidonius*), 246 (*Cypria*), 261 (*pulsabŏ, timebŏ, errabŏ*), 348 (*dicŏ*), 358 (genitive pronoun forms in *-ius*), 366 (*modŏ*), 402 (*cui*), 470 (*medicandŏ*), 507 (*moneŏ*)
scansion and position in the line *ego* (155), *ergo* (*160*, 383, 513)
unity of sense of the elegiac distich (rupture) 351

Muses (Pierides) 93, 94, 95, 104–105
as counsellors 94, 95
as (*doctae*) *sorores* 249–250, 342, 506
as messengers 93, 95, 129–130
as sources of poetic inspiration 94, 95, 126–129 (*auctores carminis*)
dialogue poet-Muses (*dialogus cum Musis*) 93, 94
springs and woods consecrated to them 127–129; *fons Castalia* 128; *Pieria* 129
myth
Apollo and Admeto 372–375
Ariadne and Theseus 502, 506–507
Pentheus and the Bacchantes 491
introductory formula *quondam* 375, 504
close formula *nunc* 507
paradigmatic function (*exemplum*) 372, 490, 491 (*docet*)
pathetic function 502

Night (*Nox*) 284
chariot of Night 282–283
descending into the Ocean 283

noun
change of gender 498
collective singular 187 (*litterae* = "epitaph"), 274 (*genus*)
neuter plural in *-a* as old collective feminine 488 (*vina*)
diminutives (hipocoristic) 116 (*libellum*), 140 (*munera parva* = *munusculum*), 512 (*ocellos*)
in apposition 269 (*nuntia*)
poetic plural 396 (*aequora*), 400–401 (*terga*), 436 (*ora*), 488 (*vina*)

nymphs 519; naiads (418, 517, 519)
Oeta, Mt. 290
oracles 267, 268
Orcus 256–257; see Dis
Palestine 180
Panchaia 181–182
Parcae (Μοῖραι) 247–249 (*tristes sorores*), 250–251 (spinning fate)
particles *at* (343, 496), *atque* (450), *autem* (418), *en* (474), *ergo* (159, 383, 513), *etenim* (125), *modo* (365–366, 479), *nam* (211, 229, 335, 396), *namque* (324), *nec* (487–488), *quare* (347–348), *quodsi* (385), *sed* (115–116, 452), *tamen* (107, 517), *tandem* (289–290)
general tendency in poetry to the postposition 115–116, 335, 405, 452, 487–488
perfumes see Spices
as a burial honour 179–180
as a sympotic topos 525–526
Persephone 421–422, 428
Phoebus see Apollo
Phrygia 216–217
Pierides see Muses
poem in dialogue form 93, 94, 108–109

preposition
inter 123 (= *intra*)
tmesis of *per* 127 (imprecation), 512 (oath)

profetic dream see Dreams
prologue-poem (dedicatory and programmatic) 93

pronouns
1st pers. pl. for 1st pers. sing. 155–156
2nd pers. pl. for 2nd pers. sing. 156
alter in place of *alius* 358, 410, 508
demonstrative for anaphoric 177
emphatic *ille* 378
genitive in *-i* of the personal and reflexive pronoun with an objective force 496
poets' aversion to the prosaic *is* 482, 482
numeral *unus* with indefinite value 498
pleonastic repetition of the relative pronoun 251
possessive pronoun in the sense of *faustus* 238
transposition of negative charge from pronoun to copulative *et* 480 (*ne quisquam* < *et nemo*)

proverbs, proverbial expression and common idioms
"after cloudy days come sunny days" 233
"after the rain the sun will shine" 497
albus dies ("happy days")/*niger dies* ("sad days") 232–233, 478–479
Alcinous as a paradigm of wealth and generosity 231
Apolline verior augur 347
Apollineus, "of an beauty worthy of Apollo" 303
aurifer rivus (*Hermus*, *Pactolus*, *Tagus*) 238–241
bibere pocula Lethes 144
carior quam ipsa vita 140–141
Cimmeriae tenebrae 447
cornua sumere 484
Croesus as a paradigm of wealth 240–241
cum aversis/propitiis auribus accipitur 237
di meliora (*faciant*) or sim. 262–263
dives Arabs 182–183
dum spiro, spero 143
ferro durior 152
frangit fortia corda dolor 156
fata negant (*sinunt*, *iubent*, *volunt*, etc.) 247–248, 455
Herculis labores 370
miseri mortales (δελοὶ βροτοί) 272
perfidus Theseus 503
plena manu 475
rapax Chimaera, *Scylla* or *Charybdis* 398, 402
saxo durior 152
tristes Kalendae veniunt! 97
usque ad cornua 123
winds carry oaths (promises, words, etc.) far away 267, 411–412, 494, 513

puer delicatus, androgynous beauty of 301, 304 (*intonsi crines*)
purple (*murex*, *fucus*, *vacinium Myrtillus*) 115
Red Sea (*Erythraeum litus*, *Mare Rubrum*) 181, 182, 222–223
Sabaea (*Arabia Felix*, today Yemen) 182
sacrificial rituals 456–458
candida hostia/nigra hostia 456–457
libations of milk and wine 456–458
mola salsa 272–273
salutatio matutina 95
Saturnia, epith of Juno 243, 244
Saturnalia 93, 96, 97, 112
Scylla 402–403
Scythia 405–406
senecta 436–439 (*damnosa senecta*), 448–449 (*veneranda senecta*)
cani capilli 436–437
curva 438–439
prisca 449
rugosa 448
tardo . . . pede 437–438

sermo amatorius (amatory topoi and lexic)
capire ("seduce") 112
crimen = "adultery" 391
cura amoris 133 (erotic senses of *cura*) *cura* = *amor* 133, 496; *cura* = *amata* 133–134, 334, 496; *cura* (μέλεμα) = love griefs 133, 190, 354, 477
death/love 143
descriptio funeris ("funeral fantasy") 147–148, 158–159, 204; see Funeral rites
female mourners (*puella*, mother, sister, etc) 166
epitaph with love as the *causa mortis* 186–192
presence of the beloved at the moment of death 204

discidium amantium 149, 237, 354, 358
dives amator (rival) 109, 147, 194, 222, 234, 357–358 (*alter vir*), 388
dolor 153, 157, 190, 471, 508
domina see *Servitium amoris*
doctus 505–506 (*poeta*); see Puella in Sermo amatorius
eripere 151
erotodidaxis (*praeceptor amoris*) 258, 260, 363, 365, 507
  tu/vos + *modo* + imperative/ subjunctive 365–366, 479
  didactic formulas 507 (*vos ego nunc moneo*), 508 (*disces*)
fallere 106, 363, 482
fides 140, *510*
flamma amoris 449–450
  torreri 451
flectere 364
foedus amoris 514 (*iura puellae*)
furtivus amor 482
gaudia (*Veneris*) = *concubitus* 205
  frui (ἀπολαύω, τέρπομαι) 243
  longas noctes 515
  pervigilare 515
  lustful siestas 515
  (*re*)*quiescere* = *cubare* 515
  torus ("bed of love") 521
Golden Age (*Aetas Aurea*) 147–148, 231, 244, 341
love illness (*morbus*) 413–414, 425, 451, 463, 470
impius (= *perfidus*) 359–360
insensitivity (topos of) 148–150; see Topoi
  crudelis 361–362
  durus 149, 152–153, 408
  ferreus 149, 151–151
  ferox 484
  immitis 381
  ingratus, *immemor* 506–507
iurgia 435
iuvenis 151
labores amoris 367, 369–371
laments of the unlucky lover to a sympathetic nature 504
lena 363
love as an ailment (*morbus amoris*) 288, 450
lover is a king 230
militia amoris 206, 369–370, 384
munera (luxurious) 96, 97, 103; 111, 221–227
  pearls 222–224
  purple (purple-dyed clothes) 224–226
mutua cura, mutuus amor (ἴσος Ἔρως) 133, 134
name of relationship 130–131 (*vir*); 130–131 (*frater*); 141 (*soror*); 141–142, 154 (*coniunx*)
not wealth and glory, but love and poetry 194, 199, 211
oaths of love (ἀφροδισίος ὅρκος) 140, 509–511
  by the eyes 510
  by Juno 510–511
  by Venus 511
  specious (*blanda*) 509–510
  the winds carry them off 411–412, 494, 513
  the gods turn a deaf ear to them 513
  periuria 503, 513
officia amoris 507, 508
paupertas (*cum amore*) 194, 214, 229, 230–231
pectus = *animus* 384, 391
perfidia amantis 502–503
perire = "to die of love" 191
possesive pronouns 106 (*mea*)
preces, blandae querellae 365–367, 382, 383–384
puella 151
  amica 516
  avara 108, 111–112, 194, 509
  cara 150, 482
  casta 139
  docta 110, 506
  dura 153
  fallax 508, 511, 514, 516
  formosa et divina 110; 305, 311–312, 314 (physical charms)
  pudica 317
  vana 522
rejection of a kingdom and preference for love 240–241
securus (= *vacuus a curis*) 241, 242, 355, 497
servitium amoris 367, *371–372*, 373, 374, 375, 382, 484–485
  domina 382, 485
  verbera saeva 371
signa amoris 130–131 (*pallor*), 287 (*insomnia*), 516 (*insomnia*), 522 (*suspiria*)

solitude, abandon 502, 504
sollicitus 289, 500, 522
suicide of love (*taedia vitae*) 143, 147, 157–158, 186, 194
tormentum amoris 371
votum = "amorous desire" 391
vulnus amoris 144, 251 ("the wounds of love can only be washed with the water of Hell")
wine as *incitamentum/remedium amoris* see Symposium in Topoi

sermo castrensis 112
sermo iudicalis, forensis 126, 514 (*iura*)
Sleep (*Somnus*, Ὕπνος) 288–289
as a remover of care 288
spices (aromatic, eastern) 180, 182
incense (*tura*) 198–199
Incense Road 182
malobathrum 308
myrrh 309
nard 308

style
adynata 390
alliteration 152, 156, 210, 381, 465, 496; see Onomatopoeia
anadiplosis 415–416 (*unda / unda*)
anaphora 150, 195, 476, 499
anastrophe 160–161, 485
antithesis 102 (*vaga/certa*); 110 (*formosae/ avarae*); 115 (*lutea/ niveum*); 138 (*vir/frater*); 138 (*coniunx/soror*); 138 (*quondam/nunc*); 262 (*meliora/pessima, vera/falsum, vani/fidem*); 384 (*molli/dura*); 409 (*saevus/mitis*); 480 (*dux/comes*); 516 (*perfida /amica*); for chromatic antithesis, see Colour contrast
antonomasia 176
apostrophe
to book 95
to gods
to Muses 94, 97
to sclave-cupbearer 472, 519
archaizing tone see Epicism
aversio 154–155, 426, 521
brachylogy 150, 288
cacophony 465 (*sic sit tibi*), 495
chiasm 138 (*vir quondam, nunc frater*); 201; 452
colour contrast 162–163, 170–171, 172, 320 (*candida/nigra, albus/ candidus, ater/niger*); 310–321 (*purpureus/candidus*), 436 (*canus/niger*)
collectio 112
correctio 141 (*seu . . . seu . . . sed potius*)
derivatio 175 (*legant/collecta*), 185 (*ponere/ componi*)
digression (*digressio*) 100, 302 (ἔκφρασις προσώπου), 329 (*pathopoeia*), 415 (ἔκφρασις τόπου)
ellipsis 458 (*merum*), 476 (*Falernum*)
emotional syntax 262
enallage (*mutatio*) 169, 198 (double enallage), 273
epicism, archaism, high-flown style 97, 98, 103, 154, 156, 197, 256–257, 282, 296 (*quies*), 305 (*intonsi crines*), 317 (*virgo* for *puella*), 327, 337 (*-que et*), 340–341 (*proles*), 343, 378 (*permulcere*), 383 (*ne dubita*), 383–384 (*dixit et*), 396 (*aequora ponti*), 400 (*caterva*), 406 (*horrenda*), 410 (encomiastic periphrasis), 435 (*iurgia*), 435–435 (*ora solvere*), 444 (*sortiti*), 450 (emphatic *atque*), 450–451 (*nequiquam*), 471 (*patera*), 485 (*ferocem contudit*), 490; see Homeric-style formulas
chronological periphrases 283; *sub Aurora* 291; night 282, 283, 355
epiphonema 125
epithets 162 (*candida ossa, nigra favilla*); 170–171 (*candida ossa, nigra vestis*); 176, 457 (*niveo lacte*); 404 (*saeva leaena*), 485 (*fulva leaena*), 495 (*aeriae nubes*)
etymological wordplays 107 (*Neaera* < νείαρα); 152 (*ferreus/ferre*); 175; 234, 237 (*reddere* = *redere*); 496 (*cura* = κώρα); 524 (*liquidum merum*)
euphony 207
geminatio 150
golden line (*versus aureus*) 201–202, 381
Hellenisms 129 (*Castalis*), 132 (*si* for *an*), 191, 197
hypallage 333, 384
hyperbaton 157, 327
homoeoteleuton 100 (*nostris . . . avis*); 351, 353 (*bella puella*)
in medias res 162, 258, 262
line-construction 162 (aAbB), 384 (aBbA), 434 (abAB), 438 (abBa), 480 (aAbB); see Golden line

litotes 342 (*non norunt* = *ignorunt*), 348 (*non fallax* = *verax*), 362 (*nec fidum* = *infidum*), 487 (*nec torvus* = *mitis*), 516 (double litotes *nec merito . . . nec . . . merenti* = *inmerito . . . inmerenti*)
metaphors
  appearance of Apollo in dreams as an allegorical formula to express 'poetic consecration' 260
  limae labor, pumex, ἀγρυπνία = consummate literary work, elegant and polished style 117, 516
  in aeternam claudantur lumina noctem = death 295
  the wings of Sleep touchs someone = "to fall asleep" 356
  the dark cloak of Night = "to get dark" 356
  the four seasons of the human life 424
  the picking of unripened fruit = *mors immatura* 439–441
  metaphors connected with changing time 233, 497
  for the erotic metaphors, see *Sermo amatorius*
metonymy 128 (*umbra* = *silva umbrosa*), 152 (*enses* = *ferrum*), 166 (*matris comitata dolore* = *ab matre dolente*), 175–176 (*Lyaeus* = *vinum*), 178 (*domus aterna* = *sepulcrum*), 196 (*caelum* = *caelestes*), 206 (*nostra senecta* = *ego senex*), 223 (*concha* = *margarita*), 233 (*lux* = *dies*), 255 (*luridus* = *pallidus*), 295 (*lumina* = *oculi*), 382 (*coniugium* = *coniunx*), 417 (*Canis, Sirius* = *aestas*), 437 (*cani* = *senecta*), 486 (*Bacchus* = *vinum*), 478 (*Delius* = "sun" = "day"), 517–519 (*Bacchus* = *vinum*; Naida = *aqua*), 521 (*torus* = "lover")
neoteric style; see Influences
onomatopoeia 210 (*littera canina*); 272 (*saliente sale*); 398 (*littera canina* and hissing 's'); 438 ('s' suggesting silent); 500 (*ebria verba*); see Alliteration
oxymoron 368 (*saevus Amor*), 381 (*immitis Glycerae*), 481 (*certamen mite*)
paronomasia 150 (*ferreus/ferre*), 415–416 (*unda/adeunda*), 442 (*māla/mala*), 489 (*nimium nimiusque*)
periphrasis 134, 144 (*ex pectore decidere* = "to forget"); 157 (*taedia vitae* = "suicide"); 171 (*pars quae sola mei superabit corporis* = *reliquiae*); 486, 472, 486 (*munera Bacchi* = *vinum*); 177 (*umorem tollere* = *siccare*); 180; 200 (*limen tecti* = "door"); 204, 207 (= the momemt of death); 236 (*terque quaterque*); 272 (*hominum genus* = *homines*); 272 (*omina noctis* = "prophetic dreams"); 283 (*aetherium mundum* = *caelum*); 285 (*caeruleus amnis* = *Oceanus*); 288, 289 (*menti deus utilis aegrae* = *Somnus*); 297 (= Apollo); 428–429 (*laudanda des* = *Bona Dea*); 431 (*mortiferi suci* = *venena*); 445 (*adire/visere Infernos* = "to die"); 451–452 (multiplicative periphrases); 453 (= swimming); 462 (= Bacchus); 490 (= Pentheus); 522 (*suspiria repetere* = *suspirare*); for chronological periphrases, see Epicism
personification 184 (*memores lacrimae*), 206 (*caderet nostra senecta*), 237 (*aversa auris*, 328 (*garrula lyra*), 332 (*fuerant digiti . . . locuti*), 359 (*agitat mens impia*)
pleonasm 154 (*qui*), 168, 207, 242, 343, 408, 439, 450, 488
poetic plural 129 (*lacus*)
poeticism 110–111 (*pulcher/formosus/bellus*), 119–120 (*coma* for *capillus*), 129 (*lacus* = *fons*), 136 (*larga donate salute* = *plurimam* or *multam salutem dicere*), 145 (*pallidus* = *infernus*), 157 (*pudor est* + infinitive = *pudet*), 161–162 (*umbra* = *anima mortui*), 170 (*liquor* = *aqua*), 177 (*carbaseis ventis* = *carbaseis velis*), 178 (*umor* = *vinum, lac*), 181 (*mittere* = "to export"), 185 (*componere* = *sepelire*), 187 (*litterae* = "epitaph"), 196 (*implere* = "to fill a place with sounds"), 203 (*renovare* = *arare*), 206 (*senecta* for *senectus*), 208 (*lux* = *vita*), 210 (*Lethaeus* = *infernus*), 213 (*findere* = *arare*), 245 (*faveas*), 309 (*ros* = "perfume"), 328 (*garrula lyra*), 352 (*cupidus* = "ardent"), 355

(*ire* 'de tempore'); 361, 390, 494 (*a!*); 362 (*femina/mulier*), 376 (*pavisse, sonorus*), 378 (*meditari*), 382 (*immitis*), 404 (*leaena/lea*); 418–419, 520 (*lymphae* = *aquae*); 431–432 (*sucus* = *venenum*), 432 (*inficere* = "to poison), 447 (*lacus* = *flumen*), 458 (*mixta*), 485 (*leo/lea/leaena*), 487 (*ex aequo*), 494 (*demens/amens*), 495 (*aerius*)
polyptoton 150 (*caram/carum, iuveni/iuvenem, eripuit/erepta*), 391 (*votis . . . vota*), 415–416 (*unda*), 516–517 (*merito . . . merenti*)
polysyndeton epic reduplication of *-que* 103
postposition of particles 115 (*sed*); see Particles
priamel (*preambulum*) 148, 194, 195, 199, 200, 211, 236, 241, 391, 413, 414
prolepsis 204, 327, 340
propemptikón (προπεμπτικόν) 236–237, 407, 454
prosaism, colloquial tone 126 (*oportet*), 139–140 (paratactical subordination), 159 (particles), 165 and 437 (*capillos*), 187 (*demonstret*), 227 (adverbs *praeterea, falso*), 256–257 (*Orcus*), 279 (*pertimuisse*), 327–328 (*pendebat laeva . . . parte*), 333 (*verba edere*), 333 (*salve*), 347 (*quare*), 352–353 (*bellus*), 386 (*nostro nomine*), 410 (*is*), 418 (*autem*), 454–455 (*vivere* for *esse*), 479 (*proposito*), 482 (*eum*), 485 (*misit in arbitrium*), 490 (interrogative particles), 499 (*ei mihi*), 511 (*etsi*), 527 *debueram . . . implicuisse*)
repetition (*adiectio*) 164 (*ante meum*), 181 (*dives*)
rhetorical question 195, 439
ring composition 188, 259, 364, 411, 448, 452
sententiae 156–157, 384; see Proverbs
simile 310–321, 351, 437
soteria (σωτηρία) 237
symmetrical pentameter 128
synecdoche 107 (*cunnus* = *lasciva mulier*); 200 (*tectum* = *domus*), 226 (*murex* = *purpura*)
synonymy 150, 499
tautology 106, 346
tmesis 127 (*per*), 163 (*super . . . teget*)
wordplays 178; see Etymology wordplays
zeugma 228 (*levantur*), 343 (*videre*), 488 (*colunt*)

symposium 459–464
  curas depellere vino 460–461, 462
  vina parant animum Veneri 461–462
  "wine gives encouragement" 484
  hymns to Bacchus 462–464; see Hymn
  ritual invocation to Liber (cletic hymn) 465
  apostrophe to a sclave to refill the cups (= libation) 472, 519, 523–525
    formula of exhortation (= *age*) *cessas?* (519–520), *en* 474, *i* (*nunc*) (523–524)
    yusive formulas *adde* (525), *funde* (474)
  cupbearer-sclave (*puer delicatus*) 472–473, 520 (*minister*), 524 (*puer*)
  pocula madida (happiness)/*pocula sicca* (sadness) 472, 473, 486–487
  arbiter bibendi (συμποσίαρχος) 480–481
  iactus Veneris 480
  exhortation to the *amici* to drink (ὦ φίλοι, πίνετε) 479, 486
  certamen bibendi (*proelia Bacchi*) 481
  ritual repudiation of worries (πρόρρησις) 477, 500, 514
  seriousness and wine do not go together 500
  to mix the wine neat with water 517
  garlands of flowers 525, 527–528
  perfume 525–526
  mixing of wine with water 517–521 (*temperare*)
  wine *annosum* (175, 520), *generosum* (473–474), *Falernum* (475–476), *iocosum* (488)

syntax
  absence of particle in the first member of a disjunctive question 132
  disjunctive indirect questions with *si . . . an* 132
  comparative clauses 351
  completive-final *ut*-clauses, stemming from a substantive 199

'constructio ad sensum' 274
interrogatives pronouns with different functions, though referring to the same verb, within the same interrogative clause 490
paratactical subordination with subjunctive mood 132, 139
polysyndetic correlation *-que et... -que* 337
infinitive construction with verbs "to swear" 140–141

Syria 180
Syrtes 407
Taenarus, promontory 217–218
thermal spas 415

topoi (for erotic topoi, see *Sermo amatorius*)
appeal to reason *quid facis a demens?* 494, 500
ataraxia of the wise man (carefree life) 214, 229
autumn as season of the fruits in plenty 320
candidior quam plena luna (radiant beauty) 310–311
candidior lilio 320
Canis aestifer, Sirius ardor 417
carpe diem 454, 460
complaints, laments (σχετλιασμός) 195–196 (*quid prodest...?*)
consolatio 444
damnosa senecta 436–439
death is binding on all, rich and poor alike 194, 211
execrationes 363
falsae opiniones of the common people 226–227
formula *ille ego* 378–379
Fortunae rota 194, 228–229
gods pay no attention to human affairs 194, 195
inexorabiles dei inferi 444

"innumerable heads of cattle" as a conspicuous sign of infinite wealth 213–214
insensitivity 391–396
Cerberus 395, 400
Chimaera 395, 398
leaena 404
raging sea 391–392, 394, 395–396
Scylla 392, 395, 403
Scythia 405–406
Syrtis 407
luxuria muliebris 509; see Avara puella in Sermo amatorius
makarismós (μακαρισμοός) 234–236, 507
mendacia vatum 376
mors inmatura (ἄωρος θάνατος) 151, 413, 423
operosae divitiae 194, 229
optata mors 158
orbis terrarum divitias accipere nolo pro... 241
people unthinkingly covet and endless number of objects 194
perfidia muliebris 360–361, 364, 502
perfidia virilis, fallacia hominum 502–503, 506–507
primus inventor (πρῶτος εὑρετής) 148–149
negative confession *non ego...* (protestation of innocence) 425–427
sacrilege 427–430 (spreading mysteries), 432–433 (burning of temples), 434–436 (blasphemy, *impia lingua*)
poisoning 430–432
crimes 434
rejection of kingdom 240–241
rejection of wealth (ψόγος) 193–194, 195, 199–204, 211–226, 229–231, 239, 240, 241
repudiation (πρόρρησις) 266, 477 (*ite procul*), 500 (*discedite*)
schetliasmós (σχετλιασμὸς) 360, 364
secura paupertas (praise of the simple life) 194, 214, 229–231
Sol omnia videt 294
solvitur acris hiems vice veris 420
somnus fessa lumina premit 294–295
Sympotic topoi; see Symposium
virginal blushing of the newly-wed bride 315
wealth does not accompany the deceased on his journey to Hades 209
wealth does not bring happiness 194
wealth attracts envy 194

Underworld (*Inferni, Hades*)
di inerfi 413, 442; see Dis, Orcus and Persephone

darkness 253
dura regna 444
Lethaea ratis (the vessel of Charon) 209
Lethe, the river of Oblivion 143
Manes 168–169
rivers (Acheron, Phlegethon, Cocytus) 251–252, 254–255
Styx (river or lake) 252, 253
tertia regna 443
vastness 252
Venus
concha Veneris 245–246
epithets *Cypria* (243, 246), *Cytherea* (243–244)
oaths of love by Venus 511

verb
ab Vrbe condita construction 100
change of mood 132 (*est . . . deciderim*), 455 (*erimus . . . velint*)
componere = *sepelire* 185
compound for the simple 175 (*colligere* = *legere*)
en + imperative 474
exhortative-optative subjunctives 165
formula of exhortation *i* (*nunc*) + imperative 523–524
fuisse = *mortuus esse* 455 456
future for subjunctive 234
gnomic perfect 153 (*potuit*), 368 (*docuit*)
impersonal periphrasis *pudor est* + infinitive 157
indicative in indirect questions 132
infinitive as noun-complement 191 (*causa perire* = *causa pereundi, causa mortis*)
negative imperative 383 (*ne dubita*)
nominalization of a participle 360 (*nupta* = *uxor*)
nominalization of a neuter future participle 269 (*venturum*), 345 (*eventura*)
optative-subjunctive 186 (*velim*)
perfect in *-ērŭnt* or *-ērĕ*, use in poetry 98, 437
perfect infinitive for the present infinitive 196–197
perfect subjunctive as potencial 390
periphrasis of obligation *debeo* + infinitive 527
pluperfect indicative in *postquam*-clause 331–332
present participle expressing priority 330
prohibition formulas for negative imperative 267, 388, 424–425
prospective future 437
simple for compound 176 (*fundere* = *perfundere*), 330 (*veniens* = *adveniens*)
subjunctive in disjunctive conditional 275

wealth, symbols of
luxurious mansion 199, 214–221
marble gates 199
porticos with polychromatic marble columns 215–218
luxuriant gardens 218–220
gold-coffered ceilings 220–221
marble flooring 221
vast streches of fertile land 201–204, 212–213
huge sums of money 211–212
innumerable heads of cattle 213–214
see *Munera*
wine see Symposium